Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
AUG 23 1978
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78-78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

—v.—

RICHARD HELMS, *et al.*,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

MELVIN L. WULF
CLARK WULF & LEVINE
113 University Place
New York, N. Y. 10003

BURT NEUBORNE
40 Washington Square So.
New York, N. Y. 10012

RICHARD W. ZACKS
WINOGRAD, SHINE & ZACKS
2220 Hospital Trust Bldg.
Providence, R. I. 02903

BRUCE J. ENNIS
American Civil Liberties
Union Foundation
22 East 40th St.
New York, N. Y. 10016

Attorneys for Petitioners

Table of Contents

	Page
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question Presented	2
Statute Involved	2
Statement of The Case	3
Conclusion	10
Appendix	
Decision of the Court of Appeals	1a
Decision of the District Court	21a

Table of Contents

Page

Adams Dairy Co. v. National Dairy Products Corp., 293 F. Supp 1135 (W.D. Mo. 1968) 10

Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents 402 U.S. 388 (1971) 6,7

Eastland Construction Co. v. Keasbey and Mattison Co., 358 F.2d 777 (9th Cir. 1965).....10

Farmers Elevator Mutual Ins. Co. v. Carl J. Austed & Sons, Inc., 343 F.2d 7 (8th Cir. 1965) 10

Goodwin v. Briggs, et al., 549 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), petition for cert. filed, 46 U.S.L.W. 3634 (U.S. March 31, 1978)(No. 77-1401) 8

Great American Ins. Co. v. Louis Lesser Enterprises, Inc., 353 F.2d 997 (8th Cir. 1965) 10

L'Heureux v. Central American Airways Flying Service, 209 F.Supp. 713 (D. Md. 1962) 10

Lowenstein v. Rooney, 401 F.Supp. 952 (E.D.N.Y. 1975)..... 8

Snyder v. Eastern Auto Distributors, Inc., 357 F.2d 552 (4th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 384 U.S. 987 (197)...10

Table of Authorities Cont.

Page

United States v. McAninch,
435 F. Supp. 240 (E.D.N.Y.
1975) 8

Wu v. Keeney,
384 F.Supp. 1161 (D.D.C.,
1974) 8

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1978

No. 78 -

Rodney D. Driver, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

Richard Helms, et al.,

Respondents.

Petition For a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court
of Appeals for the First Circuit

Petitioners pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit entered in this case on May 25, 1978.

Opinions Below

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is unreported. It is set out in the Appendix, infra, pp. 1a-20a. The opinion of the United States District Court for the Dis-

trict of Rhode Island is reported at 74 F.R.D. 382, and is set out in the Appendix, infra, pp. 21a-69a.

Jurisdiction

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on May 25, 1978. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

Question Presented

Whether, in a suit for money damages for injuries caused by constitutional torts committed during the course of the defendants' federal employment, 28 U.S.C. §1391(e) grants a federal district court personal jurisdiction over the two following classes of defendants even though they are served outside the State, and were never physically present within the State, in which the district court sits:

1. defendants no longer employed by the United States;

2. defendants who are still employed by the United States, but who are not "serving the government in the capacity in which they performed the acts on which their alleged liability is based."

Statute Involved

Title 28 U.S.C. §1391(e):

> (e) A civil action in which a defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency therof acting in his official capacity or under

> color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States, or the United States, may except as otherwise provided by law, be brought in any judicial district in which (1) a defendant in the action resides, or (2) the cause of action arose, or (3) any real property involved in the action is situated, or (4) the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action. Additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and with such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers, employees, or agencies were not a party.
>
> The summons and complaint in such an action shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought.

Statement of the Case

This class-action suit 1/ for damages was filed by petitioners in 1975 in the

---

1/ The district court certified the suit as a class-action under Rule 23(b)(3), F.R.Civ. P., App., infra, p.68a.

federal district court for Rhode Island. The damages sought were the result of injuries inflicted by a secret CIA Project entitled HTLINGUAL, carried on from 1953 to 1973, in which the CIA, without warrants ever being issued or applied for, secretly opened, read and circulated approximately 215,000 pieces of incoming and outgoing first-class mail. 2/

The twenty-five defendants in the suit are present or former high-ranking officials of the CIA, the Post Office Department, and other agencies of the United States who were responsible for, participated in, or concealed the mail-opening program. 3/ With the exception of one of the defendants who lives in Rhode Island and was personally served there, the other defendants were served outside the State. The defendants in government service were served by certified mail; those no longer in government service were served personally. 4/

2/ HTLINGUAL is fully described in the Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate, Book III, pp. 559 et seq.

3/ The current directors of the CIA and the FBI are named as defendants for purposes of injunctive relief concerning disposition of the records of the mail-opening project. The records include copies of all the letters which were opened.

4/ The Court of Appeals' statement that all defendants were served by certified mail (App., infra, p. 2a, n. 4) is incorrect.

All the defendants, save the Rhode Island resident, filed motions to dismiss under Rules 12(b)(2), 12(b)(3) and 12(b)(4), F.R.Civ.P., alleging that they had been served outside the state of Rhode Island and that, indeed, most of them had never been in the State. The plaintiffs conceded the truth of the allegations, since they believed that §1391(e) allowed effective extraterritorial service of process against present and former government officials sued for constitutional torts committed during the course of their employment.

The district court denied the motions to dismiss, agreeing with plaintiffs' interpretation of the extraterritorial reach of §1391(e), both as to defendants in government employment at the time they were served with the summons and complaint in this suit, and as to defendants no longer in government employment when served with process.

The district court certified the question to the First Circuit under 28 U.S.C §1292(b). The Circuit Court took jurisdiction and held that §1391(e) supplies venue and empowers the district court to exercise personal jurisdiction only against officials who, at the time process is served upon them, are "serving the government in the capacity in which they performed the acts on which their alleged liability is based."

Reasons For Granting The Writ

Certiorari should be granted in this case because the First Circuit has decided an important question of federal law which has not been, but should be, settled by this Court. There is also a conflict

between two Courts of Appeals.

Specifically, the issue raised is the ability of citizens, who are victims of constitutional torts committed by federal employees, to secure effective judicial relief. A construction of 28 U.S.C. §1391(e) which empowers the district courts where plaintiffs reside to exercise jurisdiction over defendants who reside beyond the courts' territorial boundaries, serves that important goal.

Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), allows suits for damages by private citizens whose constitutional rights are violated by federal officials. As the Court recognized, such tortious violations possess "a far greater capacity for harm than an individual trespasser exercising no authority other than his own." 403 U.S. at 392. The importance of effective relief is, of course, equally great.

One problem to be overcome in many such cases is the distance between the tortfeasors and their victims. Very often, a potential defendant works in the District of Columbia, or in a regional office, both of which will be some distance from the place where their victims live. Section 1391(e), as the court below correctly held to a limited extent, was adopted, at the very least, so that private citizens could conveniently bring suit in the district of their residence against distant officials. A second practical problem to be overcome in some cases - the case at bar being one example - is that because of the passage of time between commission of the tort and its discovery, some tortfeasors have left government employment.

As to the second problem, the court below held that §1391(e) empowered the federal courts to exercise personal jurisdiction, in actions for money damages over federal officials, no matter where they reside, only if, at the time process is served upon them, they are still in government employment and, furthermore, are "serving the government in the capacity in which they performed the acts on which their alleged liability is based." App., infra, p. 6a. That holding eviscerates §1391(e) by requiring private citizens seeking redress for violation of their constitutional rights to sue some wrongdoers in their places of residence, rather than in the jurisdiction where the plaintiff resides. Given the expense of litigation in general, to require plaintiffs to bring suit at a distance from their residence means that suit will often not be brought at all. To that extent, a very effective remedy to vindicate constititutional rights is lost, as is the effect that such suits for damages have in deterring the commission of other constitutional violations. See Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, supra at 411 (Burger, Ch. J., dissenting).

The Circuit Court's holding that §1391(e) does not grant in personam jurisdiction even over government officials unless they are serving in the same capacity as they were in at the time of the alleged commission of the tort, is an extremely grudging interpretation of the statute which has no support in the cases or the legislative history. Since government employees are promoted through the ranks in the normal course of ther careers, the court's limitation on thelanguage of §1391(e) threatens its

usefulness in a significant way. If the statute has extraterritorial effect at all in constitutional tort cases against government officials, as the Circuit held, there is no logic to support a distinction between allowing service on defendants who remain in the same post throughout their careers, and forbidding service on those who have been promoted, a distinction which the Circuit explicitly left open. App. infra, p. 6a n.11. The district court's thoughtful opinion did not even hint at such a distinction, and there ought to be none. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, construing the same statute, imposed no such limit upon the application of §1391(e) to defendants in government employment. Goodwin v. Briggs, et al., 549 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), petition for cert. filed, 46 U.S.L.W. 3634 (U.S. March 31, 1978)(No. 77-1401). To that extent, there is a split in the Circuits since the District of Columbia Circuit allows effective service upon present employees under §1391(e), regardless of whether the defendant is serving in the "same capacity" as at the time of the commission of the tort.

The district court's view that §1391(e) applies across the board to former officials was the correct interpretation. Other courts have come to the same conclusion. 5/ As

---

5/ United States v. McAninch, 435 F. Supp. 240 (E.D.N.Y. 1977), and Lowenstein v. Rooney, 401 F.Supp. 952 (E.D.N.Y. 1975). In the only contrary opinion, Wu. v. Keeney, 384 F.Supp. 1161 (D.D.C. 1974), the court did not have the benefit of any briefing on the point.

the district court below saw it, the question was to "ascertain the Congressional intention in §1391(e). If the plaintiffs' construction would entail a significant added burden on government service, that would be persuasive reason to conclude that Congress would not have taken such a step without comment." 74 F.R.D. at 395; App. infra, p.49a. After examing defendants' alleged burdens, the district court found that there were none of any significance. Ibid. It did not see personal liability for damages as such an added burden on government service, since Bivens already imposes such a burden. Nor did the court think that defense of such cases by former officials was a burden since, as in the case at bar, "it is the policy of the Justice Department to defend lawsuits against present and former officials by citizens claiming redress for actions accomplished under color of legal authority." Ibid. 6/

The First Circuit decision on the point was based only on the absence of legislative history one way or another, and on its view that the use of the present tense in §1391(e) meant that the defendants must be in government employment at the time suit was filed. That too is a very grudging reading of the statute. The statute's liberal purpose is best served by reading it to mean that it applies if the defendandants in government service at the time the constitutional violation occurred. For example,

---

6/ In the case at bar, the Justice Department retained private counsel to represent each of the defendants.

in Farmers Elevator Mutual Ins. Co. v. Carl J. Austed & Sons, Inc., 343 F.2d 7, 12 (8th Cir. 1965), the "doing business" requisite of §1391(c) was held to relate to the time when the cause of action arose. This construction was reaffirmed in Great American Ins. Co. v. Louis Lesser Enterprises, Inc., 353 F.2d 997, 1001 (8th Cir. 1965). A similar conclusion was reached in Snyder v. Eastern Auto Distributors, Inc., 357 F.2d 552 (4th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 384 U.S. 987; in L'Heureux v. Central American Airways Flying Service, Inc., 209 F.Supp. 713, 715 (D. Md. 1962); and in Nelson v. Victory Electric Works, Inc., 210 F. Supp. 954 (1962). Similarly, the provision in the Clayton Act referring to the place where a defendant "transacts business" was held to relate to the time when the cause of action arose. Eastland Construction Company v. Keasbey & Mattison Co., 358 F.2d 777, 780 (9th Cir. 1965). Similarly, see Adams Dairy Co. v. National Dairy Products Corp., 293 F.Supp. 1135 (W.D. Mo., W.D. 1968).

A decision concerning the interpretation of §1391(e) is an important question of public law, because if the construction of the First Circuit is upheld, many constitutional violations will go unredressed.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, a petition for certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin L. Wulf
Clark Wulf & Levine
113 University Place
New York, N.Y. 10003

Burt Neuborne
40 Washington Square S.
New York, New York 10012

Richard W. Zacks
Winograd, Shine & Zacks
2220 Hospital Trust Bldg.
Providence, R.I. 02903

Bruce J. Ennis
American Civil Liberties
Union Foundation
22 East 40th St.
New York, New York 10016

Attorneys for Petitioners

August 1978

United States Court of Appeals
For the First Circuit

No. 77-1482

RODNEY D. DRIVER, et al.,

APPELLEES,

v.

RICHARD HELMS, et al.,

APPELLANTS.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

[HON. RAYMOND J. PETTINE, *U.S. District Judge*]

Before COFFIN, *Chief Judge*

CAMPBELL AND BOWNES, *Circuit Judges.*

Walter H. Fleischer, Donald J. Cohn and *Jacquelin A. Swords,* with whom *Earl Nemser, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft, George M. Vetter, Jr., Hinckley, Allen, Salisbury & Parson, Seymour Glanzer, Kenneth Adams, Joel Kleinman, Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, James V. Kearney, Nancy E. Friedman, Webster & Sheffield, Alan T. Dworkin, Aisenberg & Dworkin, Joseph V. Cavanagh, Higgins, Cavanagh & Cooney, Charles R. Donnenfeld, Cameron M. Blake, Rodney F. Page, Arent, Fox, Kintener, Plotkin & Kahn, Guy J. Wells, Gunning, LaFazia & Gnys, Inc., Alfred F. Belcuore, Cole and Groner, P.C., Harry W. Asquith, Edward W. Moses, Swan, Kenney, Jenckes & Asquith, Wallace L. Duncan, Duncan, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer, Joseph Dailey* and *Breed, Abbott & Morgan* were on briefs, for appellants.

Melvin L. Wulf, with whom *Clark, Wulf & Levine, Burt Neuborne, Richard W. Zacks, Winograd, Shine & Zacks,* and *Joel M. Gora* were on brief, for appellees.

Barbara Allen Babcock, Assistant Attorney General, *Lincoln C. Almond,* United States Attorney, *Robert E. Kopp* and *Paul Blankenstein,* Attorneys, Appellate Section, Civil Division, Department of Justice, on brief for United States, amicus curiae.

May 25, 1978

COFFIN, *Chief Judge.* Plaintiffs-appellees brought this action in 1975 in the federal district court for the district of Rhode Island on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated. Their complaint alleges that the defendants-appellants[1] illegally interfered with their mail, thereby violating appellees' rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments. The suit seeks damages and declaratory and injunctive relief. Subject matter jurisdiction was invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331(a), 1339, 1343, 1361, and 5 U.S.C. § 702.

Appellants are 25 present or former United States government officials, each sued in his individual and in his official or former official capacity. One of the named plaintiffs, Driver, lives in Rhode Island,[2] but none of the appellants reside in or have substantial contacts with Rhode Island, and the complaint does not allege that any illegal activity occurred in Rhode Island.[3] Therefore, venue is not proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), and, since none of the appellants were served within Rhode Island,[4] service of process was inappropriate under F. R. Civ. P. 4(f).

Appellees invoke 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) to support venue and service of process:[5]

> "A civil action in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency

---

[1] Other defendants in the case below are not parties to this appeal.

[2] The other named plaintiffs are residents of New York, Minnesota, Connecticut, and California.

[3] The illegal interference with appellees' first-class mail is alleged to have occurred in New York City.

[4] The appellants each were served by certified mail outside Rhode Island.

[5] Appellees also suggested that Rhode Island's long arm statute supplied jurisdiction. R.I. Gen. Laws § 9-5-33 (1956). *See Driver v. Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382, 400 n. 23 (D. R.I. 1977). This issue is not presented by this appeal.

thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States, may, except as otherwise provided by law, be brought in any judicial district in which: (1) a defendant in the action resides, or (2) the cause of action arose, or (3) any real property involved in the action is situated, or (4) the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action.

"The summons and complaint in such an action shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought."[6]

Appellants filed motions to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) (lack of jurisdiction over the person), 12(b)(3) (improper venue), and 12(b)(4) (insufficiency of process). The district court denied these motions, but certified that the questions involved controlling issues of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and that an immediate appeal could materially advance the litigation. *Driver* v. *Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382, 401-02 (D. R.I. 1977). We thus have appellate jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

Appellants argue that 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), contrary to the holding of the district court, does not give venue to the district court in Rhode Island, does not give the court

---

[6] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) was amended in 1976. The word "each" was changed to "a" in the first sentence, and the following sentence was added to the end of the first paragraph:

"Additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and with such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers, employees, or agencies were not a party."

P.L. 94-574, § 3, 90 Stat. 2721 (Oct. 21, 1976).

jurisdiction over the persons of the appellants, and does not authorize the service of process on these appellants. They argue that reliance on § 1391(e) is misplaced because that section does not apply to former officials, does not apply to suits against officials for damages in their individual capacities, and does not independently supply in personam jurisdiction.

THE FORMER OFFICIALS

Ordinarily the plain meaning of the language of a statute is controlling. *See Massachusetts Financial Services, Inc.* v. *Securities Protector Investor Corp.*, 545 F.2d 754, 756 (1st Cir. 1976). Section 1391(e) applies, by its terms, when a "defendant *is* an officer or employee of the United States . . . *acting* in his official capacity or under color of legal authority . . . ." (emphasis added) Because the operative language is in the present tense, we read the section to exclude a defendant who *was* an officer or employee.

"Of course, deference to the plain meaning rule should not be unthinking or blind. We would go beyond the plain meaning of statutory language when adherence to it would produce an absurd result or 'an unreasonable one "plainly at variance with the policy of the legislation as a whole."' " *Massachusetts Financial Services, supra,* 545 F.2d at 756, *quoting United States* v. *American Trucking Ass'ns, Inc.*, 310 U.S. 534, 543 (1940), *quoting Ozawa* v. *United States*, 260 U.S. 178, 194 (1922); *cf. Natural Resources Defense Counsel* v. *TVA*, 459 F.2d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1972) (eschewing the "tyranny of literalness").[7] We do not, however, find any indication in the statute itself or in the legislative

[7] "[W]hen aid to construction of the meaning of words, as used in the statute, is available, there certainly can be no 'rule of law' which forbids its use, however clear the words may appear on 'superficial examination.'" *United States* v. *Culbert*, 46 U.S.L.W. 4259, 4260 n. 4 (U.S. March 28, 1978), *quoting United States* v. *American Trucking Ass'ns, Inc.*, 310 U.S. 534, 543-44 (1940).

history that former officials were meant to be included. We are not alone in this conclusion. *See Kipperman* v. *McCone*, 422 F. Supp. 860, 876 (N.D. Cal. 1976); *Wu* v. *Keeney*, 384 F. Supp. 1161, 1168 (D. D.C. 1974).

The cases that have reached a contrary result have decided that excluding former officials would undercut the policies of § 1391(e). *See Driver* v. *Helms, supra*, 74 F.R.D. at 398-400; *United States* v. *McAninch*, 435 F. Supp. 240, 245 (E.D. N.Y. 1977); *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney*, 401 F. Supp. 952, 962 (E.D. N.Y. 1975). We do not think it absurd or plainly at variance with the policies of § 1391(e) to limit it to those who are government officials at the time the action is brought.[8] We are unimpressed by the specter of government officials resigning their positions simply because they fear an action might be brought against them. As the court below noted, resignation would not terminate their liability. *See Driver* v. *Helms, supra*, 74 F.R.D. at 399-400. The most an official could gain would be to avoid venue in the district where a plainitiff lives. A career in government service is, one would think, a disproportionate sacrifice to make for so small a gain. Moreover, we are not persuaded that Congress' desire "to provide readily available, inexpensive judicial remedies for the citizen who is aggrieved by the workings of Government", H. Rep. No. 536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. 3 (1961) [hereinafter referred to as House Report], indicates that Congress meant § 1391(e) to provide a net that could draw everyone connected with a governmental action into litigation in a particular district. For instance, those who were never government officials but are defendants in a law suit clearly cannot be

[8] We do not focus on a later time, such as the time when a hearing is held or a decision issued, because the statute speaks to the ability to bring an action. Moreover, if a court were not able to determine venue at the time an action is brought, judicial processes could be thrown into chaos by mobile litigants.

reached by § 1391(e).[9] In fact there is a clear indication in the legislative history that Congress did not mean to reach at least those former officials who have moved away from Washington.[10] Therefore, we reverse the district court as to this point and hold that § 1391(e) does not apply to those defendants who, at the time this action was brought, were not serving the government in the capacity in which they performed the acts on which their alleged liability is based.[11]

PERSONAL DAMAGE ACTIONS

The next issue we must face is whether § 1391(e) applies to actions for damages against officials in their individual capacities. Section 1391(e) was passed, together with 28 U.S.C. § 1361, as the Mandamus and Venue Act of 1962. Before 1962 most actions against federal officials could not be brought outside the District of Columbia. Higher officials residing in Washington were usually indispensable parties against whom venue could not be secured except in Washington. Furthermore, such actions

---

[9] That such defendants may exist is indicated by the 1976 amendment. *See* note 6, *supra*.

[10] "This bill is not intended to give access to the Federal courts to an action which cannot now be brought against a Federal official in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia." H. Rep. No. 536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1961). Prior to 1962 (when the bill was passed) former officials who had moved away from Washington would not have been subject to suit in Washington.

[11] The act is directed at officials "*acting* . . . under color of legal authority". Since official acts expose the officer to expanded venue, and since we have concluded that this exposure terminates when the official leaves office, it would be anomalous to hold that one of the appellants serving the government in a different capacity is nonetheless still exposed to national venue and service of process. As to the act or omission that exposed him to liability, it is only fortuitous that he is still in government. We need not now decide whether someone who has been promoted in the same department is likewise exempted from the operation of § 1391(e).

were often in the nature of mandamus, and federal district courts outside the District of Columbia lacked subject matter jurisdiction over mandamus actions. The crux of appellants' argument is that § 1391(e) should be narrowly construed as a companion to § 1361, designed to combat the specific, relatively narrow problem that spurred Congress to act. That is, they would have us read § 1391(e) to do no more than supply venue in those suits made possible by § 1361, "suits in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff."

The Second Circuit has twice followed similar reasoning, but in cases distinguishable from ours. In *Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland*, 426 F.2d 1379 (2d Cir. 1970), the court said that § 1391(e) was aimed at the mischief posed by the inability to review government action outside Washington and that § 1391(e) reached only those who might be subject to compulsion under § 1361. The holding of the case, however, was that the section did not apply to legislators.[12] The court did not have occasion to decide the kinds of civil actions that could be brought against someone to whom § 1391(e) did apply. In *Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *TVA*, *supra*, 459 F.2d at 255, the court said that §§ 1391(e) and 1361 must be read together, *id.* at 258, and that the literal meaning should not necessarily control, *id.* at 257; but the holding was that § 1391(e)'s venue provisions did not apply to the TVA because another statute controlled venue for actions against the TVA. *Id.* at 259. Section 1391(e) states that it applies "except as otherwise provided by law." The court went on to point out that a suit against the TVA could not have been brought in Washington before 1962. *See* House Report, *supra*, at

[12] We do not indicate our views on this holding. *See* note 17, *infra*.

2.[13] In this case the action, at least as against current officials, could have been brought in Washington.

The weakness of the argument, even apart from the fact that it reflects no clear signal from the legislative history discussed below, is that we must interpret the United States Code as it is written. Congress did not limit the application of § 1391(e) to "actions in the nature of mandamus". Rather Congress used the words "[a] civil action in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States . . . acting . . . under color of legal authority." The statute does not, by its terms, limit the kind of civil action to which it applies. The case at bar is a civil action. The complaint alleges that the defendant officers of the United States were acting "under color of legal authority". All elements fit — and we deal with a statute speaking in a highly technical field, venue and jurisdiction, where, if anywhere, precision is required.

The plain language of § 1391(e) covers this case, but again we would go beyond the plain language if the result were absurd or plainly at variance with congressional policies. We conclude, after considering such questions, as have many other courts, that § 1391(e) should cover damage actions against officers in their individual capacities.[14] *See Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, 569 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977); *Ellingburg* v. *Connett*, 457 F.2d 240, 241 (5th Cir. 1972);

---

[13] *See* note 10, *supra*.

[14] The Supreme Court has said that § 1391(e) does not apply to habeas corpus actions, *Schlanger* v. *Seamans*, 401 U.S. 487, 490 n. 4 (1971), but that decision turned on the special nature of habeas corpus actions which though "technically 'civil,' . . . [are] not automatically subject to all the rules governing ordinary civil actions." *See also* the cases cited by the court below. 74 F.R.D. at 391-92.

We might have viewed *Relf* v. *Gasch*, 511 F.2d 804 (D.C. Cir. 1975), as contrary authority, but in *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, *supra*, 569 F.2d at 6-7, the same circuit confined *Relf's* holding to situations where the alleged wrong was not connected with the defendant's government service.

Driver v. *Helms, supra; United States* v. *McAninch, supra; Lowenstein* v. *Rooney, supra; Patmore* v. *Carlson,* 392 F. Supp. 737, 738 (E.D. Ill. 1975); *Wu* v. *Keeney,* 384 F. Supp. 1161 (D. D.C. 1974); *Green* v. *Laird,* 357 F. Supp. 227 (N.D. Ill. 1973); Hart & Wechsler, The Federal Courts and the Federal System 1388 (1973); 2 Moore, Federal Practice ¶ 4.29, 1210 (1977). *Cf. Kletschka* v. *Driver,* 411 F.2d 436, 442 (2d Cir. 1969) (basing venue on § 1391(b) but adding that § 1391(e) "seems" to apply as well). *But see Kenyatta* v. *Kelly,* 430 F. Supp. 1328, 1330 (E.D. Pa. 1977); *Davis* v. *F.D.I.C.,* 369 F. Supp. 277 (D. Colo. 1974); *Paley* v. *Wolk,* 262 F. Supp. 640 (N.D. Ill. 1965).

The legislative history of § 1391(e) is at best ambiguous, but there are indications that the drafters of the legislation understood that the act might apply to actions such as this one and were not sufficiently bothered by that possibility to prevent it. This act originated as H.R. 10089, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (1960).[15] That bill was limited to officers acting in their official capacity, and its author, Representative Budge, explained that it was intended to meet the narrow problem described above. Hearing Before the Committee on the Judiciary (Subcommittee No. 4), 86th Cong., 2d Sess. 2-4 (May 26 and June 2, 1960) [hereinafter cited as Hearings].[16] The hearings on the bill before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary demonstrate that at least some members of that subcommittee did not want the bill limited to a narrow purpose. For instance, at one point Mr. Drabkin, the subcommittee's counsel, stated, "I think what

[15] H.R. 10089 read, in pertinent part:

> "A civil action in which each defendant is an officer of the United States in his official capacity, a person acting under him, or an agency of the United States, may be brought in any judicial district where a plaintiff in the action resides."

[16] The unpublished transcripts of these hearings were submitted to us by appellants, and appellees have not disputed their authenticity. We have verified the authenticity, accuracy, and availability of these transcripts through the office of the General Counsel to the House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary.

this bill is concerned with doing is dealing with mandamus and also dealing with petitions for review which may not properly be brought now because of some venue defect." Congressman Dowdy responded, however, "I asked to be sure it was not limited to that." *Id.* at 32.

Later in the same hearing Mr. MacGuineas, a representative from the Department of Justice, said he did not understand what the bill was trying to do. "In order to understand that we would have to know how this bill is intended to affect each particular type of suit that a citizen may want to bring against a Government official, and there are many different types." Congressman Dowdy responded, "Maybe we want it to apply to all suits. There is not any particular one. We want it to apply to any one." Congressman Whitener followed that up by saying, "I did not understand there was any doubt." *Id.* at 53-54. One type of suit hypothesized by Mr. MacGuineas was a slander suit against a congressman.[17] Congressman Whitener indicated that he felt the bill should cover such a situation, Hearings, *supra* at 55, and he compared it to a postal worker slapping a housewife as he delivered mail. *Id.* at 58.

The desire to reach a variety of causes of action prompted the first mention of the "under color of legal authority" phrase. After a discussion whether certain kinds of acts would constitute official action or not, Mr. Drabkin proposed, "Suppose in order to take care of a body of law which seems to say that when a government official does something wrong he is acting in his individual capacity, we added the following language—'acting in his official

[17] The Second Circuit has held that § 1391(e) does not apply to legislators, but the holding was based in part on not finding any "word in the five year gestation period of § 1391(e) to suggest that Congress thought it was changing the law not merely with respect to the executive branch but also concerning itself, its officers and its employees." *Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland*, 426 F.2d 1379, 1384 (2d Cir. 1970). This issue is not presented to us, and we do not decide it.

capacity or under color of legal authority.' That would not bring in the type of situation in which a postman, after he had gone home for the night, proceeded to run over somebody's child." *Id.* at 61-62. This is the first appearance of the "under color" language, and its context suggests that it was understood to exclude only those personal damage actions arising from purely private wrongs.

The Department of Justice expressed reservations about the utility of H.R. 10089 because it was limited to "official actions", and did not expand subject matter jurisdiction. Most actions against government officials, such as those seeking personal damages for acts in excess of official authority, would not be covered by a bill limited to "official capacity". Actions that would be "official", would be equivalent to mandamus actions, and so would still be confined to the District of Columbia for lack of subject matter jurisdiction elsewhere. *See Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra,* 569 F.2d at 4. The new bill, H.R. 12622, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (1960), met these objections. Section 1 of the bill added a new section, now codified as 28 U.S.C. § 1361, extending mandamus jurisdiction to all district courts.[18] In section 2 of the bill, § 1391(e), Congress included, inter alia, the phrase "under color of legal authority". *See Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra,* 569 F.2d at 4-5.

This bill was reintroduced in the next Congress as H.R. 1960, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1961). The Department of Justice, in a letter from then Assistant Attorney General Byron White suggested more changes. The letter recognized that section 2 of the bill, the new § 1391(e) "covers an entirely different subject" than section 1, the new 28 U.S.C. § 1361, and that unless clarified § 1391(e) might

[18] 28 U.S.C. § 1361 reads:

"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff."

apply to "suits for money judgments against officers." S. Rep. No. 1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. (1962), 1962 U.S. Code Cong. & Adm. News 2784, 2789 [hereinafter cited as Senate Report].[19] Though acting on other suggestions from that letter,[20] Congress did nothing to eliminate personal damage actions. In fact, both the House and Senate reports state, "The venue problem also arises in an action against a Government official seeking damages *from him* for actions which are claimed to be without legal authority but which were taken by the official in the course of performing his duty." House Report, *supra,* at 3; Senate Report, *supra,* 1962 U.S. Cong. & Admin. News at 2786 (emphasis added).[21]

In the face of all of this, appellants argue that § 1391(e) was meant to do no more than provide venue in cases to which § 1361 applies, actions in the nature of mandamus brought outside the District of Columbia. In support of this argument they point to language in the legislative history that "[t]he purpose of this bill is to make it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia, which, because of certain existing limitations on

---

[19] At minimum this letter demonstrates that Congress was on notice that personal damage actions against government officials were possible, contrary to appellants' argument that due to broad immunity under the doctrine of *Barr* v. *Mateo,* 360 U.S. 564 (1959), and because *Bivens* v. *Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics,* 403 U.S. 388 (1971), was not yet decided, Congress would not have been thinking of such actions.

[20] For example, the letter suggested that the mandamus jurisdiction section should be limited to actions to compel a duty "owed the plaintiff". The Senate, by amendment adopted this provision, and the House accepted the amendment. *See* note 17, *supra. See generally Briggs* v. *Goodwin,* 569 F.2d 1, 5 n. 39 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

[21] This passage undermines appellants' argument that the only damage actions Congress contemplated were actions in the nature of mandamus against an official to recover money allegedly owed to the plaintiff by the United States.

jurisdiction and venue, may now be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia." House Report, *supra*, at 1. Appellants also point to the following paragraph of the Report:

> "By including the officer or employee, both in his official capacity and acting under color of legal authority, the committee intends to make the proposed section 1391(e) applicable not only to those cases where an action may be brought against an officer or employee in his official capacity. It intends to include also those cases where the action is *nominally brought against the officer in his individual capacity even though he was acting within the apparent scope of his authority* and not as a private citizen. *Such actions are also in essence against the United States* but are brought against the officer or employee as individual only to circumvent what remains of the doctrine of sovereign immunity. The considerations of policy which demand that an action against an official may be brought locally rather than in the District of Columbia require similar venue provisions where the action is *based upon the fiction that the officer is acting as an individual.* There is no intention, however, to alter the venue requirements of Federal law insofar as suits resulting from the official's private actions are concerned." *Id.* at 3-4 (emphasis as supplied by appellants).

We do not think that these passages clearly exclude the result that we have reached. Even if we were to acknowledge that the primary purpose of § 1391(e) was to expand venue in mandamus cases, that would not preclude it from serving other purposes as well. That it does do so and was intended to do so is indicated by the legislative history described above.

Further, unless one were prepared to argue that the 1976 amendment was a mistake, we think it must be taken as a further indication that Congress, whatever its intent at the time it passed § 1391(e), now understands the section to reach personal damage actions. The amendment, note 6, *supra,* allows defendants who are not government officers to be joined in an action with officers when venue as to the officers is asserted under § 1391(e). It would make little sense to join someone who is not an officer if the suit were limited to an action in the nature of mandamus. Therefore, the suit Congress was contemplating must be aimed at acts that can give rise to liability for private remedies.

We affirm the district court's holding that § 1391(e) applies to personal damage actions.

Personal Jurisdiction

Appellants' final argument is that § 1391(e)'s service of process provision facilitates the broadened venue provisions, but only if the district in which the suit is brought can establish personal jurisdiction by some other mechanism. In the alternative they argue that even if § 1391(e) broadens personal jurisdiction, it would be unconstitutional to apply it to individuals who lacked the minimum contacts with the state in which the court sits that are required by *International Shoe Co.* v. *Washington,* 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and its progeny.

Appellants state their argument as follows:

> "Nothing in Section 1391 speaks to personal jurisdiction. The statute is entitled 'venue generally' and sets forth in its various sections the rules of venue in civil actions. The statute specifically authorizes only a method of service of process, as distinct from a grant of *in personam* jurisdiction, for the federal officers or agencies within its purview. Indeed, the service of process provision in the statute emphasizes the focus

> of the statute on review of agency actions and present officials since service is to be made 'to the officer or agency.' The statute addresses only the mechanics of service of process and does not address the exercise of personal jurisdiction. Obviously, it is one thing for an individual to be served the process extraterritorily [*sic*], but quite another for that individual to be subject to the personal jurisdiction of a court in compliance with the Constitutional requirements of due process."[22]

It is true that jurisdiction over the person and service of process are distinguishable, but they are closely related.[23] "[S]ervice of process is the vehicle by which the court may obtain jurisdiction." *Aro Manufacturing Co.* v. *Automobile Body Research Corp.*, 352 F.2d 400, 402 (1st Cir. 1965). If Congress, by § 1391(e), authorized service of process beyond the geographical limits that F. R. Civ. P. 4(f) would otherwise impose, and if such service does not violate the Constitution, then service was properly made in this case, and the court properly acquired jurisdiction over the persons of the appellants.

Because appellants are being sued in their individual capacities, they must be served as required by F. R. Civ. P.

---

[22] The facts that § 1391(e) was part of "The Mandamus and Venue Act" and that it is codified in a chapter labelled "District Courts; Venue" are factors to consider in determining whether the statute can be used as a basis of personal jurisdiction. They do not overcome, however, the plain language of the statute, which read in the light of the legislative history, *see United States* v. *Culbert*, *supra*, note 7, as set out in the text, indicates that the statute confers personal jurisdiction as well as venue. Moreover, there is not an obviously more appropriate chapter of the code. The chapter entitled "District Courts; Jurisdiction" deals exclusively with subject matter jurisdiction.

[23] The distinction is most important, as an issue of federal practice, in diversity cases. A state long arm statute might authorize extraterritorial service of process that would reach a defendant over whom the state could not constitutionally exercise personal jurisdiction.

4(d)(1), rather than 4(d)(4) or 4(d)(5). That is, a copy of the summons and complaint must be personally delivered. Rule 4(f), however, limits service of process to the territory of the state in which the court is sitting. But Rule 4(f) permits statutory exceptions, and Congress has, in some cases, authorized service of process beyond state boundaries. *See Robertson* v. *Railroad Labor Board,* 268 U.S. 619, 622 (1925); 4 Wright & Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure, § 1125 (1969); Hart & Wechsler, *supra,* at 1106-07. The first question is whether Congress did so in this case.

The second paragraph of § 1391(e) provides that "[t]he summons and complaint . . . shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought." Clearly this provision does more than describe the mechanics of service of process. It creates an exception to the general rule by allowing service of process anywhere in the United States by certified mail.

Not only does our reading of the statute command such an interpretation, but we are persuaded that this is precisely what Congress intended. Judge Maris, testifying before the subcommittee as a representative of the Judicial Conference, pointed out that the original bill, H.R. 10089, created a "problem about the acquisition of jurisdiction in personam by the Court in the venue" created by the bill. Hearings, *supra,* at 87. The bill relied on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to provide service of process, but Rule 4 would not permit service of process on the individual involved in the suit if that individual were outside the state in which the suit was brought. Judge Maris suggested that the statute provide for broader service:

"There are statutes which do, like the Antitrust Laws, the Sherman Antitrust Act, under which you can bring a suit against defendants and serve them anywhere in the United States, and of course under the Bankruptcy Act you can serve persons anywhere in the United States.

"Now what you would have to do here it seems to me would be to provide for the service that we discussed, namely, service upon the U.S. Attorney, service by mail upon the Attorney General, and also service by mail anywhere in the United States upon the officer or agent being sued.

"That would take care of it because all that is necessary is for Congress to authorize service to be made outside of the District, and it is perfectly valid to do so." Hearings at 88-89.

Congress, following Judge Maris' suggestion, provided nationwide service of process by mail and expected that broadening service would correspondingly broaden personal jurisdiction. Congress recognized that it would serve no purpose to broaden venue without also broadening service of process. House Report, *supra*, at 4. *See Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra*, 569 F.2d at 7-8. Thus, to the same extent that § 1391(e) supplies venue, it supplies the mechanism to secure personal jurisdiction.[24]

---

[24] *See Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra*, 569 F.2d at 8; *Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland*, 426 F.2d 1379, 1382 (2d Cir. 1970) (dictum); *United States* v. *McAninch*, 435 F. Supp. 240, 244 (E.D. N.Y. 1977); *Driver* v. *Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382, 389 (D. R.I. 1977); *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney*, 401 F. Supp. 952 (E.D. N.Y. 1975); *Crowley* v. *United States*, 388 F. Supp. 981, 987 (E.D. Wis. 1975); *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.* v. *Froehlke*, 348 F. Supp. 338, 364 (W.D. Mo. 1972), *aff'd*, 477 F.2d 1033 (8th Cir. 1973); *English* v. *Town of Huntington*, 335 F. Supp. 1369, 1373 (E.D. N.Y. 1970); *Macias* v. *Finch*, 324 F. Supp. 1252, 1255 (N.D. Cal. 1970); *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* v. *Denver & Rio Grande Western R.R. Co.*, 290 F. Supp. 612 (D. Colo. 1968), *aff'd*, 411 F.2d 1115 (10th Cir. 1969). *Cf. Ashe* v. *McNamara*, 355 F.2d 277, 279 (1st Cir. 1965).

Having concluded that Congress did create nationwide service of process, we must next decide whether § 1391(e), so interpreted, is constitutional. Appellants argue, and we will assume, that they lack "minimum contacts" with the State of Rhode Island. The minimum contacts test was developed in cases testing the limits of a state's jurisdiction over those not found within its boundaries. The circumscription of state court jurisdiction is a product of boundaries to states' sovereignty.[25] The United States, however, whose court is here asserting jurisdiction, does not lose its sovereignty when a state's border is crossed. The Constitution does not require the federal districts to follow state boundaries. That decision was made by Congress, and Congress could change its mind. Whether or not Congress could go so far as to establish only one national district court, *see Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra,* 569 F.2d at 9, it is clear that Congress could greatly reduce the number of federal districts and draw their boundaries without regard to state boundaries. *See id.*, at 8-10.

---

[25] This remains true even after *International Shoe Co.* v. *Washington,* 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and *Shaffer* v. *Heitner,* 433 U.S. 186 (1977). A state boundary is still a significant jurisdictional demarcation because if a defendant is found and served within the state, minimum contacts need not be established, and jurisdiction may be asserted on the basis of the state's sovereignty. We see no reason why the United States does not have the same power over defendants found within its borders. Even if we were to say that minimum contacts had to be established, anyone found and served within the United States would have sufficient contacts with the United States. *See United States* v. *McAninch,* 435 F. Supp. 240, 244 (E.D. N.Y. 1977).

Appellants argue that the two Supreme Court cases cited above demonstrate that the Court has banished sovereignty as a factor in determining jurisdiction, substituting a test based on "[f]air play and substantial justice [which] are in the main functions of distance." We can think of no case that has made distance a factor in determining minimum contacts. The test to determine whether a defendant may be brought before a state's courts, say the courts of Rhode Island, is no different whether that defendant is found in Connecticut or in Hawaii.

Appellants next argue, with some force, that it would be very unfair and would violate due process to force them, as individuals, to answer suits in districts with which they have no connection and, further, that answering such suits places a burden upon them greater than that carried by a private litigant who would not have to travel to a far-away court—a court which might be far removed from the place where the cause of action arose, and which might have been chosen because the plaintiffs felt the judge would be friendly to their claims. We acknowledge that these appellants may have to answer complaints in a broader range of judicial districts than would non-governmental defendants. But they are not without protection. A district court has broad discretionary power "[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, [to] . . . transfer any civil action to any other district . . . where it might have been brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). We would expect courts to be sympathetic to motions for change of venue when defendants would otherwise be substantially prejudiced and when there is an alternative venue that would protect the parties' rights. Furthermore, we note that officers of the federal government are different from private defendants because they can anticipate that their official acts may affect people in every part of the United States.

Congress is, of course, limited in the actions it can take by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, but application of the Clause is not related to state boundaries. Rather, the requirement is that the nationwide "service required by statute must be reasonably calculated to inform the defendant of the pendency of the proceedings in order that he may take advantage of the opportunity to be heard in his defense." *Mariash* v. *Morrill*, 496 F.2d 1138, 1143 (2d Cir. 1974). Certainly the certified mail requirement in § 1391(e) meets that standard. Such service is not extra-

territorial for a court of the United States; therefore, the minimum contacts analysis is not relevant. We conclude that national service of process as provided by § 1391(e) is constitutional.[26] *Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra,* 569 F.2d at 8-10; *United States* v. *McAninch, supra,* 435 F. Supp. at 244; *Driver* v. *Helms, supra,* 74 F.R.D. at 391.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

[26] The Supreme Court has apparently not decided this precise issue since *International Shoe.* In one case the Court decided not to address the issue. *United States* v. *Scophony Corp.,* 333 U.S. 795, 840 n. 13 (1948).

Adm. Office, U. S. Courts — Blanchard Press, Inc., Boston, Mass.

RODNEY DRIVER *et al.*

v.

RICHARD HELMS *et al.*

Civ. A. No. 75-224.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
D. RHODE ISLAND.

April 1, 1977.

OPINION

PETTINE, Chief Judge

Plaintiffs are five American citizens who have brought this action on behalf of themselves and all those similarly situated against thirty present and former officials. The amended complaint alleges that the defendants "engaged in an extended conspiracy to conduct an illegal and unconstitutional program surreptitiously to intercept, open, read and photograph tens of thousands of sealed first-class letters deposited in the United States mails by plaintiffs and members of their class", thereby violating plaintiffs' rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments.[1] Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief to operate against Defendant Clarence Kelley, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; damages against each of the other

1. Events giving rise to this lawsuit are described in the Report to the President by the Commission on CIA activities (June 6, 1975) (hereinafter referred to as the "Rockefeller Report"). *See also* Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with respect to intelligence Activities, Final Report, Book III, 559-679, S.Rep.No.94-755, 94th Cong., 2nd Session (1976) (hereinafter referred to as the Final Report of the Select Committee).

defendants, sued in his individual and official, or former official, capacities; and certain other relief.[2]

Subject matter jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331(a), 1339, 1343, 1361, and 5 U.S.C. § 702.

After extensive consultation with the parties, the Court issued an Order setting up a procedure for disposition of the expected deluge of preliminary motions. This Opinion, pursuant to that Order, disposes only of the individual defendants' motions to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) (lack of jurisdiction over the person), 12(b)(3) (improper venue), and 12(b)(4) (insufficiency of process); of plaintiffs' motion to certify the class; and of the motions to dismiss Clarence Kelley.

Each defendant against whom damages are sought[3] has moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue. Plaintiffs argue that this Court has jurisdiction over the persons of all defendants under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) and Rhode Island's long-arm statute, Section 9-5-33, Rhode Island General Laws (1956), as amended, and that venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (e).

Personal Jurisdiction and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)

Rule 4(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures provides for service of a district court's process anywhere within the territorial limits of the state in which the district court is held and, when authorized by a statute of the

2. The United States' motion to intervene as a party-defendant was granted on September 26, 1975. *See Driver* v. *Helms*, 402 F.Supp. 683 (1975) for earlier proceedings in this case. Damages are now sought against the United States directly under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(a). The Court will defer ruling on the pending Motion to Dismiss of the United States and will consider it together with the Motion to Dismiss of defendant U.S. in *Driver* v. *United States*, No. 76-297.

3. Except the United States. *See* note 2, *supra*.

United States, beyond the territorial limits of that state. Each of the defendants was served far outside the territorial limits of Rhode Island; to justify this process, plaintiffs contend that 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) (1976) is a statute authorizing such national service of process in damage actions against present and former government officials acting under color of legal authority.

As plaintiffs point out, prior to the passage of § 1391(e) in 1962, citizens were unable to obtain effective relief for claims against federal officials arising from violations of federal law. Rule 4(f), F.R. Civ. P., prevented the federal courts from exercising personal jurisdiction over non-resident federal officials. And even if jurisdiction could be acquired pursuant to state law (long-arm statutes were just coming into general use at the time), venue in a federal question action would only lie in the district where all the defendants resided. *Compare* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (1962 ed.) (venue where all defendants reside) with 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (Supp. 1975) (adding venue "in the judicial district . . . in which the claim arose"). Thus, in cases where plaintiff's claim arose from the joint acts of federal officials who resided in different districts, citizens were forced to file separate suits against the defendants in the districts where they resided. In cases where a superior federal officer residing in Washington, D.C. was an "indispensable" party to an action, citizens were only able to litigate the claim in the District of Columbia, and were unable therefore to join a subordinate officer residing elsewhere who was equally necessary to the action. *See generally* 4 Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil § 1107, at 417, (1969 ed. Supp. 1976); 2 J. Moore, Federal Practice § 4.29, at 1209 (2d ed. 1975).

As a result of these obstacles, litigation against federal officials for redress of statutory and constitutional rights

was "too expensive and inconvenient for many plaintiffs". Hart and Wechsler, The Federal Courts and the Federal System 1386 (1973).

To eliminate at least some of these obstacles and to enable citizens to obtain relief against official wrongdoing effectively, conveniently, efficiently, economically, and fairly, § 1391(e) was enacted in 1962. As the Senate Report stated, the purpose of the statute was "to provide readily available, inexpensive judicial remedies for the citizen who is aggrieved by the workings of Government". S. Rep. No. 1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 3 (1962). Section 1391(e) provides:

> A civil action in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States, may, except as otherwise provided by law, be brought in any judicial district in which (1) a defendant in the action resides, or (2) the cause of action arose, or (3) any real property involved in the action is situated, or (4) the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action.
> The summons and complaint in such an action shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action was brought. [4]

---

4. Sec. 1391(e) was enacted as part of the Mandamus and Venue Act of 1962. The legislative history is contained in H.R.Rep.No. 536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1961) [hereinafter H.Rep.]; S.Rep.No.1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. (1962), reprinted in 1962 *U. S. Code Cong. and Adm. News*, pp. 2785-2786 [hereinafter S. Rep.]

The Act of October 21, 1976, Pub.L. 94-574, § 3, amended § 1391 (e), adding after the last sentence of the first paragraph the following:

The defendants argue that § 1391(e)(1) does not supply personal jurisdiction (2) does not apply in actions for damages, (3) does not apply to officials sued in their "individual" capacity, and (4) does not apply to former federal officials. The Court turns to each of these arguments.

1. § 1391(e) supplies personal jurisdiction

[1] This Court is of the firm opinion that § 1391(e) is indeed a statute authorizing nationwide jurisdiction which would be otherwise unavailable to a federal court bound by Rule 4(d). This opinion is shared by the great majority of courts, and all of the commentators, which have considered the question. And the legislative history of § 1391(e), while not a model of clarity, amply supports the Court's conclusion.

The House Committee Report accompanying § 1391(e) states:

> In order to give effect to the broadened venue provision of this bill, it is necessary to modify the service requirements under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure insofar as they apply to actions made possible by this bill. Rule 4(f) restricts effective service to the territorial limits of a State in

---

Additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and with such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers, employees, or agencies were not a party.

This amendment was intended only to overrule the holdings of some courts that § 1391 was inapplicable when there were any non-federal defendants. *See* 105 Cong.Rec. S11352 (daily ed. July 1, 1976), *citing Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *TVA*, 459 F.2d 255, 257 n. 3 (2d Cir. 1972). Having examined the legislative history of this amendment to § 1391(e), the Court does not believe that it in any way affects the conclusions here reached.

> which the district court is held unless a statute specifically provides for it to go beyond the territorial limits of that State. Since this bill is designed to make a Federal official or agency amenable to suit locally, the bill provides that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency may be made by certified mail outside of the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought.

H. Rep No. 536, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., at 4 (1962). Professor Moore agrees that subsection (e) both expands venue and extends the area in which the district court's process will run:

> [Sec. 1391(e)] realistically broadens venue in any civil action (not just mandamus proceedings) where each defendant is a federal officer, employee or agency and is sued for acts done in his official capacity or under color of legal authority; and provides for extraterritorial service of process, if necessary, in such an action. 2 J. Moore, Federal Practice, § 4.29, 1210 (2d ed. 1975).

Accord, 4 Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure, Civil § 1107 (1969 ed., Supp.1975).

The Second Circuit has stated that where § 1391(e) is applicable, it supplies both venue and *in personam* jurisdiction. *Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland,* 426 F.2d 1379 (2d Cir. 1970) (dicta). *Accord, Lowenstein* v. *Rooney,* 401 F.Supp. 952, 961-962 (S.D.N.Y. 1975); *Crowley* v. *United States,* 388 F.Supp. 981, 987 (E.D. Wis. 1975); *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.* v. *Froehlke,* 348 F.Supp. 338, 364 (W.D.Mo.1972), *aff'd on other grounds,* 477 F.2d 1033 (8th Cir. 1973); *English* v. *Town of Huntington,* 335 F.Supp. 1369, 1373 (E.D.N.Y. 1970); *Macias* v. *Finch,* 324 F.Supp. 1252, 1254-1255 (N.D. Cal.

1970); *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* v. *Denver and R.G.W.R. Co.*, 290 F.Supp. 612, 615-616 (D.Colo. 1968), *aff'd* 411 F.2d 1115 (10th Cir. 1969); *Powelton Civic Home Owners Ass'n* v. *Department of Housing and Urban Renewal*, 284 F.Supp. 809, 834 (E.D.Pa.1968). *See also Relf* v. *Gasch*, 167 U.S.App.D.C. 238,511 F.2d 804, 808 (Robb, J., concurring).

Defendants argue that § 1391(e) speaks only to service of process, not to the exercise of personal jurisdiction, which they contend must be otherwise acquired. Typical of this line of argument is the following passage from the brief of Defendants Colby, Schlesinger, Cushman, and Walters, which the Court finds necessary to quote from at length:

> The distinction between the mechanics of service of process and whether service is effective to confer personal jurisdiction is elementary and clear. Plaintiffs appear to treat the two together without an appreciation of the fact that two very different concepts are involved.
>
> "Although Rule 4 [of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure] is concerned with defining the various acceptable methods for effecting service of process, its operation cannot be understood without an appreciation of the history and current status of the law relating to the personal jurisdiction of the courts. This is true because underlying the question of service of process is the preliminary inquiry into whether the court has the power to summon a defendant before it to adjudicate a claim against him. • • • Rule 4 does not speak to this subject, which at present is governed primarily by the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Due Process Clause of the Constitution and the network of state and federal statutory provisions." 4 Wright and Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (1969) at pp. 205-206.

Stated simply, the second paragraph of Section 1391(e) provides that in cases which fall within its scope, that is when jurisdiction is already present and venue is conferred by the first paragraph of Section 1391(e), the mechanics of service of process shall be "as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure" except those mechanics are modified to the extent that "delivery of the summons and complaint [under Rule 4(d)(5)] may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought". Such a modification of the method of service of process under the Federal Rules does not answer, as plaintiffs would have this Court believe, the "preliminary inquiry into whether the Court has the power to summon a defendant before it to adjudicate a claim against him". 4. Wright and Miller, *supra*, at p. 205.

> Not at all dissimilar this scheme is the operation of state service of process provisions such as the Rhode Island rules. Service of process is permitted by mail beyond the territorial limits of the Rhode Island courts, R.I.C.P., Rule 4(e), but this alone does not confer jurisdiction since before a defendant is amenable to such service and thereby subject to the jurisdiction of Rhode Island, he must have the "necessary contacts" with Rhode Island.

[2] By applying to § 1391(e), analysis germaine to jurisdiction under Rule 4, F.R. Civ.P. the defendants completely misperceive the nature of the problem at hand, and rely on an inapposite line of cases, *e.g.*, *Hanson* v. *Denckla*, 357 U.S. 235, 78 S.Ct. 228, 2 L.Ed.2d 1283 (1958); *McGee* v. *International Life Ins. Co.*, 355 U.S. 220, 78 S.Ct. 199, 2 L.Ed.2d 223 (1957); *International Shoe Company* v. *State of Washington*. 326 U.S. 310, 66 S.Ct. 154, 90 L.Ed. 95 (1954). For

those cases in which Congress has decided that the jurisdiction of federal courts shall be coextensive with the jurisdiction of the states in which they sit (that is, all cases directly ruled by Rule 4(d)), minimum contacts analysis is indeed in order. State courts may exercise jurisdiction only over defendants within their territory or over defendants who are deemed present within the territory by virtue of purposeful activity which constitutes such minimum contacts. *International Shoe, supra.*

[3] However, Congress may provide for national service of process, i.e., national exercise of personal jurisdiction by each of the district courts based on presence of the defandant in the United States, rather than in any particular state. *Robertson* v. *Railroad Labor Board,* 268 U.S. 619, 45 S.Ct. 621, 69 L.Ed. 1119 (1925). *See Hart and Wechsler, supra,* at 1106. When Congress does so provide,[5] the district court's service is not constrained by the due process (*International Shoe, Hanson* v. *Denckla*) limits to which state courts are subject. *See Mariash* v. *Morrill,* 496 F.2d 1138, 1142-43 (2d Cir. 1974). Instead, the due process limitation on national service of process is found by inquiring into the fairness of such jurisdiction in the particular circumstances and facts of the case at hand, an inquiry mandated by the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause. *Mariash* v. *Morrill, supra,* at 1142-43; *see also Oxford First Corp.* v. *PNC Liquidating Corp.,* 372 F.Supp. 191, 198-205 (E.D.Pa. 1974). *Cf. International Shoe, supra,* 326 U.S. at 320, 66 S.Ct. 154.

[4, 5] The Court believes that the exercise of national personal jurisdiction pursuant to § 1391(e) here is consistent with the applicable due process test. In *Mariash* v.

5. For a partial list of other statutes which authorized federal courts to exercise national *in personam* jurisdiction, see 2 J. Moore, Federal Practice par. 433 at 1242 (2d ed. 1975); id. par. 4.42(i), at 1293.8-1293.10.

Morrill, supra, the Second Circuit held that Congressionally authorized national jurisdiction satisfied due process if it was based on service calculated to inform the defendant of the proceedings in order that he may take advantage of the opportunity to be heard. As Chief Judge Kaufman noted, speaking for a panel including Associate Justice Clark, nationwide service of process, when authorized by Congress, is not extra-territorial at all. Therefore, the due process limitation on such process should be precisely the limitations applicable on a state's process within its territorial limits: notice calculated to inform the defendant of the pendency of the suit. *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank and Trust,* 339 U.S. 306, 70 S.Ct. 652, 94 L.Ed. 865 (1950).[6] Since it is undisputed that each of the defendants has been served according to the statute, and that such notice informed each defendant of the pendency of this suit so as to enable them

6. Extra-territorial service of process must be based on necessary minimum contacts to satisfy due process. *International Shoe Company* v. *State of Washington,* 326 U.S. 310, 66 S.Ct. 154, 90 L.Ed. 95 (1945). In *Oxford First Corp.* v. *PNC Liquidating Corp.,* 372 F.Supp. 191 (E.D.Pa.1974), the court went further, holding that the due process limits on *national* service of process should be governed by a five-part fairness test, incorporating a minimum contacts test. But *Oxford First* relied primarily on *Leasco Data Processing Equipment Corp.* v. *Maxwell,* 468 F.2d 1326 (2d Cir. 1972), which had required a showing of minimum contacts only because it was a true case of *extra-territorial service* of nationwide process—service under the Securities Act of 1934 on a foreign citizen living abroad. *See* the Second Circuit's explanation of *Leasco* in *Mariash* v. *Morrill,* 496 F.2d 1138, 1143 n. 9. For that reason, it was necessary to determine whether those citizens had the necessary "minimum contacts" with the United States. Thus the *Oxford First* court seems to have proceeded on an incorrect premise; as Chief Judge Kaufman has made clear. Congressionally authorized nationwide service (as opposed to extra-territorial service) must meet only the requirements of *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank and Trust,* 339 U.S. 306, 70 S.Ct. 652, 94 L.Ed. 865 (1950), not those of *International Shoe, supra. See Mariash* v. *Morrill,* 496 F.2d 1138, 1143 n. 9.

to take advantage of the opportunity to be heard, the Court finds that the service effected comports with Due Process.

Defendants attempt to buttress their argument that § 1391(e) authorizes service only where *in personam* jurisdiction is otherwise acquired through minimum contacts by relying primarily on *Schlanger* v. *Seamans*, 401 U.S. 487, 91 S.Ct. 995, 28 L.Ed.2d 251 (1971), *Strait* v. *Laird*, 406 U.S. 341, 92 S.Ct. 1693, 32 L.Ed.2d 141 (1972), *Smith* v. *Campbell*, 450 F.2d 829 (9th Cir. 1971) and *Carney* v. *Laird*, 326 F.Supp. 741 (D.R.I. 1971), *aff'd*, 462 F.2d 606 (1st Cir. 1972). The Court finds these cases inapposite.

In *Schlanger* v. *Seamans, supra*, the Supreme Court held that an Arizona federal court was without jurisdiction to entertain a habeas corpus petition of an enlisted man in the Air Force who, although temporarily in Arizona, was under the custody of officials at Moody Air Force Base in Georgia.

The Court's rationale was simply that § 1391(e) did not apply to habeas corpus actions. The Court qualified its holding that jurisdiction over respondents in habeas corpus actions was territorial by observing:

> Although by 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) (1964 Ed., Supp. V), Congress has provided for nationwide service of process in a "civil action in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States," the legislative history of that section is barren of any indication that Congress extended habeas corpus jurisdiction. . . . Though habeas corpus is technically "civil", it is not automatically subject to all the rules governing ordinary civil actions. (citations omitted) 401 U.S. at 490 n. 4, 91 S.Ct. at 997.

Section 1391(e) applies to actions against government officers "except as otherwise provided by law". The Court found in *Schlanger* that the habeas corpus statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2241, did indeed provide otherwise. Therefore,

§ 1391(e) did not apply, and a district court's reach of *in personam* jurisdiction in habeas corpus actions was limited to the traditional territorial jurisdiction of the district courts.

The other habeas corpus decisions cited by the defendants follow from the rule established in *Schlanger, supra,* and establish only the proposition that § 1391(e) is unavailable to establish personal jurisdiction in habeas corpus actions. *See* 4 Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure, § 1107, at 89 (Supp. 1975). In *Strait* v. *Laird, supra,* the Court held that the territorial jurisdiction of the district court for habeas corpus actions could be justified by using the respondent's minimum contacts in the district to impute his presence there. The Court did not find it appropriate to cite or discuss § 1391(e) at all, basing its decision on its interpretation of 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In *Carney* v. *Laird, supra,* this Court relied on *Schlanger,* holding that § 1391(e) did not extend the habeas corpus jurisdiction of the district courts. That opinion did not consider, much less decide, whether § 1391(e) authorized the exercise of *in personam* jurisdiction beyond the limits provided by Rhode Island's long-arm statute in civil actions other than habeas corpus. *Carney* v. *Laird, supra,* at 744.

Smith v. *Campbell, supra,* cited by many of the defendants, appears to support their contention that § 1391(e) is unavailable to ground personal jurisdiction in civil actions.[7] However, *Smith* too was a habeas corpus action, relying on the rule of *Schlanger* v. *Semans.* The dicta so heavily relied on by defendants appears to have exactly the same meaning as this Court's observations in *Carney* v. *Laird, supra.* To the extent that the Ninth Circuit meant

7. "Section 1391 may not be utilized to confer jurisdiction, but can be in order to effectuate jurisdiction once it has attached." 450 F.2d at 834.

to generalize its position to civil actions other than habeas corpus, this Court is in disagreement, and respectfully declines to follow.

2. *Section 1391(e) applies to damage actions*

Defendants make two related claims which bear on the question whether the liberalized terms for securing personal jurisdiction under § 1391(e) can be invoked in actions for damages against current federal officials. First, they argue that § 1391(e) pertains only to actions in the nature of mandamus against government employees under 28 U.S.C. § 1361. Second, they contend that § 1391(e) does not apply to defendants sued in their "individual" capacities. The Court will consider each of these arguments in turn.

a. *Section 1391(e) applies to damages actions as well as mandamus actions.*

[6] Section 1391(e), by its terms applies to any civil action in which "a defendant is an officer or employee of the United States . . . acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority". On its face, then, § 1391(e) covers far more than mandamus actions. However, the Supreme Court has held that habeas corpus actions do not fall within § 1391(e), *Schlanger* v. *Seamans, supra,* 401 U.S. at 490 n. 4, 91 S.Ct. 995 and this Court must decide whether the subsection is inapplicable to damage actions as well.

Defendants rely on the legislative history of § 1391(e) for their argument that Congress meant to restrict its application to mandamus actions. There is no doubt that the legislative history can be read to support such a position. However, the Court believes that properly read the legislative history makes it clear that § 1391(e) refers to damage actions as well as mandamus actions.

At the outset, the Court wishes to emphasize what should be apparent. If Congress wanted to limit the application of § 1391(e) to mandamus actions, the statutory language it chose was extraordinary ill-fitted to that task. The subsection applies to "a civil action in which [each] defendant is an officer . . .", not to "any action in the nature of mandamus . . ." which was the language Congress used in 28 U.S.C. § 1361, a statute passed together with § 1391(e). Congress has demonstrated its ample ability to distinguish between civil actions in general and mandamus actions in particular, and this Court believes that the legislative history contradicting the plain meaning of the subsection would have to be unusually clear and persuasive to warrant adoption of a reading which a) is opposed to the plain meaning of the words of the subsection, and b) attributes such carelessness to Congress. The Court therefore turns to the legislative history, and to an attempt to discern "the mischief" at which § 1391(e) was directed.

The Mandamus and Venue Act of 1962 contained two "entirely different subjects",[8] accordingly to then-Deputy

---

8. There is clearly a contradiction between the recognition by the Department of Justice that §§ 1361 and 1391(e) covered "entirely different subject[s]" and Judge Friendly's admonition that §§ 1361 and 1391(e) must be read together. *See Natural Resources Defense Council v. TVA*, 459 F.2d 255, 258 (2d Cir. 1972). Defendants rely on Judge Friendly's dictum to argue that § 1391(e) only authorizes service and jurisdiction in actions made possible by § 1361—that is, mandamus actions. As the House Report states,

> this bill is not intended to give access to the federal court to an action which cannot now be brought against a federal official in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

H.Rep.No.536, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., at 2. However, for reasons stated below in the text, this Court finds the language of the House Report refers only to the subject matter jurisdiction conferred in Section 1 of the bill, which became § 1361. *See also* Cramton, Nonstatutory Review of Federal Administrative Action, 68 Mich.L.Rev. 387, 453 (1970), and *infra* n. 10.

Attorney General Byron R. White, whose letter so stating to Senator Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, appears in the official legislative history. *See* U.S. Code Cong. and Adm.News, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess., at 2789 (1962). First in what is now 28 U.S.C. § 1361, Congress facilitated review of administrative actions by abrogating the ancient rule by which only the district court for the District of Columbia had jurisdiction to mandamus federal officers. *See Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland, supra* at 1383. As Judge Friendly has noted "this jurisdictional change . . . became the main subject of Congressional and executive concern". *Id.* Second, in what became 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), Congress authorized broadened venue and national service of process in civil actions against employees of the United States "acting in . . . official capacity or under color of legal authority". S.Rep. No. 1992, 1962 U.S. Code Cong. and Adm.News, *supra*, at 2786.

The presence of these two separate subjects accounts for the difficulties caused by the legislative history, which makes sense only on the understanding that § 1391(e), but not § 1361, extends beyond mandamus actions. Both the House and Senate Reports contain the following paragraph, in identical words:

> The venue problem also arises in an action against a Government official seeking damages from him for actions which are claimed to be without legal authority but which were taken by the official in the course of performing his duty.
>
> H.Rep. at 3; S.Rep. at 3.

Hart and Wechsler, supra, at 1388, say that "A literal reading of the statutory language would make the section applicable to all types of 'civil actions' against federal

officers, and that is precisely how most courts have construed § 1391(e)". Professor Moore agrees:

> . . . [Sec. 1391(e)] realistically broadens venue in any civil action (not just mandamus proceedings) where each defendant is a federal officer, employee, or agency and is sued for acts done in his official capacity or under color of legal authority; and provides for extraterritorial service of process, if necessary, in such an action.

2 Moore, Federal Practice, paragraph 4.29, 1210 (2d ed. 1971)

As plaintiffs demonstrate, numerous courts have applied the statute to a variety of settings where the complaint sought monetary relief for the violation of constitutional rights. In *Ellingburg* v. *Connett*, 457 F.2d 240, 241 (5th Cir. 1972), the Fifth Circuit held that § 1391(e) applies to a damage action by a federal prisoner against prison officials for unconstitutional treatment. *See also Patmore* v. *Carlson*, 392 F.Supp. 737, 739-740 (E.D.Ill.1975). In *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney*, 401 F.Supp. 952 (S.D.N.Y.1975), the court applied § 1391(e) to a damage claim against present and former officials for violating plaintiff's constitutional rights. In *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, 384 F.Supp. 1228, 1230 (D.D.C.1974), the court applied § 1391(e) to a damage action arising out of the unlawful conduct of federal prosecutors in a criminal case. *Wu* v. *Keeney*, 384 F.Supp. 1161 (D.D.C.1974) and *Green* v. *Laird*, 357 F.Supp. 227 (N.D.Ill.1973) also recognized the applicability of § 1391(e) to damage actions.[9]

9. While some of the above-cited cases fail directly to address the issue, in each of them a close reading makes it clear that the court of necessity relied on § 1391(e) to ground at least venue, and usually jurisdiction as well, in a damage action. This Court rejects the suggestion of some defendants that this authority is worthless by virtue of those courts' failure to focus in on the problem, at least

See also Jacoby, The Effect of Recent Changes in the Law of "Non-statutory" Judicial Review, 53 Georgetown L.J. 19, 36-37 (§ 1391(e) applicable to damage suits against officers acting under color of legal authority); Cramton, Nonstatutory Review of Federal Administrative Action, 68 Mich.L. Rev. 387; 455 (1970) (same).[10]

Against this strong authority, defendants make a series of arguments based primarily on the fact that § 1391(e) was passed jointly with the Mandamus Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1361. They rely on the following language in the legislative history:

> The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to make it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia, which because of certain existing limitations on jurisdiction and venue, may now be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.
>
> This bill will not give access to the Federal courts to an action which cannot now be brought against a Federal official in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. S.Rep.1992, *supra*, at 2; 1962 U.S. Code Cong. and Adm.News, *supra*, at 2784-85.

Since the present action was not cognizable only in the District of Columbia prior to the passage of the Mandamus and Venue Act of 1962, the argument goes, the statute cannot encompass this claim.

---

where so many courts made the same "mistake" and where each of the defendants was presumably represented by counsel from the Department of Justice, who would have been alerted to § 1391(e)'s potential for reaching damage actions from the outset. *See* fn. 22, *infra*.

10. The Court notes that Dean Cramton has been publicly recognized by the Senate as the craftsman of the revisions of § 1391(e). *See* 105 Cong.Rec. S11532 (daily ed. July 1, 1976). His views are therefore of considerable weight and importance.

There are a number of crucial errors in this line of reasoning.

First, the defendants argue that this action could have been brought in any district "where the claim arose", and for that further reason is not an action which could only have been brought in the District of Columbia before passage of Section 1391(e). However, as plaintiffs observe, that venue provision did not exist until 1966, when 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) was amended. Moreover § 1391(e)(1) provides venue in the district where *one* of the defendants resides. If the defendants may reside in more than one district, then all the defendants need not reside in the District of Columbia. Thus, subsection (e)(1) contemplates actions against individuals who do not reside in the District of Columbia and therefore could not have been sued there prior to the enactment of § 1391(e).

A close reading of the legislative history convinces the Court that the language cited by defendants was addressed not to the entire bill but solely to the mandamus section. In his letter to Senator Eastland, then-Deputy Attorney General White expressed the concern of the Justice Department that the act might be construed to extend the mandamus power to instances where there was no clear legal duty.

> Courts interpreting the mandate to require a Federal officer "to do his duty" might find a much greater power intended than the existing mandamus power in the District of Columbia court to which the proposed statute does not refer explicitly or implicitly. S. Rep., *supra*, at 6; 1962 U.S. Code Cong. and Adm. News, *supra*, at 2788.

In response to this concern, the Senate Committee added clarifying language to § 1361, and inserted in its Report the above-cited language, limiting the new mandamus sub-

ject-matter jurisdiction of the district courts to the power which had previously existed in the District of Columbia. This limitation was not addressed to that part of the bill which became 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

It is noteworthy that the Deputy Attorney General's letter had gone on to suggest tying section 2 of the bill, (now § 1391(e)), to the Administrative Procedure Act, to

> ". . . unquestionably eliminate[s] suits for money judgments against officers . . ." S. Rep 1992, *supra*, at 6; U.S. Code Cong. and Adm. News, *supra*, at 2789.

Although Congress adopted White's other suggestions it refused to act on this one. While such Congressional inaction is of course not dispositive, the fact that Congress was made aware of the construction which § 1391(e) invited is telling. The Court finds this additional support for its conclusion that the statements in each Report, that the venue and jurisdictional problem of suing federal officers for damages would be solved by § 1391(e), indeed say what they seem to say.

In summary, the legislative history clearly states that the venue provisions were intended to overturn the decisions by which citizens seeking relief against government officials were forced to sue in Washington, D.C. by virtue of the the then-operative federal question venue statute (venue was available only where all defendants resided) [11] and the indispensable party rule (even where the defendant official was in plaintiff's local district, a superior officer in

---

11. Since venue in federal question cases at the time § 1391(e) was passed was available only where defendants resided, *see supra* at 2, the great majority of the defendants here could have been sued only in Washington, D.C. under that former venue statute. Therefore, if Congress intended § 1391(e) to apply only to actions which, at the time of its passage, could be brought in Washington, D.C., many of the pending motions to dismiss would still have to be denied.

Washington found indispensable would defeat the action, since venue would be improper in the home district.) *See* S.Rep., *supra* at 2-3, U.S.Code Cong. and Adm. News, *supra*, at 2786. *See also* 4 Wright and Miller § 1107, *supra* at 419-420. The same history specifically includes damage actions in the catalogue of "mischiefs" to be remedied. It is therefore not surprising that defendants have not cited a single case which holds that § 1391(e) is inapplicable to damage actions.[12]

The Court can only conclude, therefore, that § 1391(e) does indeed apply to damage actions. Whether it applies to actions seeking damages against officials as individuals, and where those officials are *former* employees, remain to be considered.

b. *Section 1391(e) applies to defendants sued in their "individual" capacities for actions accomplished under color of legal authority.*

[7] All the defendants to whom the plaintiffs look to recover money damages for the violation of their constitutional rights, are sued in their "individual" capacity, and also in their "official" or "former official" capacity, as the case may be (depending on whether they are or are not now in government employ). But it is the "individual" capacity which allows recovery of money damages. That designation satisfies the fiction which was first adopted in *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 28 S.Ct. 441, 52 L.Ed. 714 (1908), in order to overcome the impediment of sovereign immunity. Its purpose is to characterize the illegal or unconstitutional acts of government officials done under color of legal authority (i.e., in the course of employment), as their own for

12. Defendants do cite authority that § 1391(e) is inapplicable to damage actions brought against defendants individually. *See* part 2(b), *infra*.

which they may incur liability. As it was specifically put in *Ex Parte Young:*

> If the act which the [official] seeks to enforce be a violation of the federal Constitution, the officer in proceeding under such an enactment comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. 209 U.S. at 159-60, 28 S.Ct. at 454 (emphasis added).[13]

Acknowledgement of the fiction, and its function, is explicitly contained in § 1391(e) which uses the language "under color of legal authority".[14]

The House Committee Report explained the significance of the phrase (H.R.Rep. pp. 3-4):

> By including the officer or employee, both in his official capacity and acting under color of legal authority, the committee intends to make the proposed section 1391(e) applicable not only to those cases where an action may be brought against an officer or employee in his official capacity. It intends to include also those cases where the action is nominally brought against the officer in his individual capacity even though he was acting within the apparent scope of his authority and not as a private citizen. Such actions are also in essence against the

13. Though *Ex Parte Young* was an action to enjoin a state official, the fiction has been transported to apply to federal officials, *Larson* v. *Domestic and Foreign Commerce Corp.*, 337 U.S. 682, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 93 L.Ed. 1628 (1949), and to actions for money damages. *Monroe* v. *Pape*, 365 U.S. 167, 81 S.Ct. 473, 5 L.Ed.2d 492 (1961) (state officials); *Bivens* v. *Six Unknown Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971) (federal officials).

14. The phrase was inserted over the objection of the Justice Department, which argued for the statute's limitation to acts done in an official capacity. Jacoby, *Nonstatutory Judicial Review*, 53 Geo.L.J. 19, 32-33 (1964).

> United States but are brought against the officer or employee as an individual only to circumvent what remains of the doctrine of sovereign immunity. Considerations of policy which demand that an action against an official may be brought locally rather than in the District of Columbia require similar venue provisions where the action is based upon the fiction that the officer is acting as an individual. There is no intention, however, to alter the venue requirements of Federal law insofar as suits resulting from the official's private actions are concerned. *Id.* at 3—4.

Defendants agree that damages can be awarded against them only in their individual capacities. However, they contend that § 1391(e) does not authorize jurisdiction or venue in damage suits against federal officers sued in their individual capacities, citing *Relf* v. *Gasch*, 167 U.S.App.D.C. 238, 511 F.2d 804, 807 n. 15 (1975) and *Paley* v. *Wolk*, 262 F.Supp. 640, 643 (N.D.Ill.1965), *cert. denied*, 386 U.S. 963, 87 S.Ct. 1031, 18 L.Ed.2d 112 (1967).

In *Relf* v. *Gasch*, *supra*, plaintiffs sought to mandamus a district judge in the District of Columbia to prevent a transfer of a lawsuit from Washington, D.C. to Alabama. The underlying suit was against federal officials residing in Washington. The Court of Appeals granted the mandamus, finding that venue would not exist in Alabama under § 1391(e), by holding that § 1391(e) was inapplicable where damages were sought against defendants as individuals. The only authority the Court gave for this proposition was *Paley* v. *Wolk*, *supra*.

In *Paley* v. *Wolk*, *supra*, plaintiff claimed that federal patent officers were involved in a "confidence game" to pocket plaintiff's patent application fees. The court concluded that the action arose out of essentially private acts for

private gain, that the wrongful acts were not done in the course of the defendant's duties, and that § 1391(e) did therefore not apply. 262 F.Supp. at 643.

With due respect, this Court believes that the *Relf* decision is insupportable in light of the language of § 1391(e), the legislative intent discussed *supra*, and the *Paley* case. *Paley* simply tracks the language of § 1391(e), holding that the subsection is available only when acts complained of are performed "under color of legal authority". The acts complained of in *Paley* were found not to be performed "under color of legal authority". In *Relf, however*, as here, it is clear that plaintiffs were complaining of precisely such acts as are covered by the terms of § 1391(e). See Hart and Wechsler, *supra*, at 1388; S.Rep., *supra*, at 3. Contrary to defendants' contentions and *Relf*, § 1391(e) does not exclude all damage actions against officers sued individually. It excludes damage actions against officers sued individually when those acts are not accomplished under color of legal authority—i. e., when the acts complained of are private acts accomplished for private gain.[15] This reading fully conforms to the congressional intention in passing § 1391(e), which was to facilitate suits seeking redress against the misuse of governmental power.

---

15. *See, e.g., Griffith* v. *Nixon*, 518 F.2d 1195 (2d Cir. 1975), dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because the acts complained of were, like those in *Paley* v. *Wolk, supra*, private acts done for private gain. This distinction is made in other areas of the law relating to public officials. *See, e.g., United States* v. *Ehrlichman* 546 F.2d 910, 921 (D.C.Cir.1976) where the court stated:

> There is no violation of Section 242 [42 U.S.C. § 242], however, if a sheriff and his deputies commit a murder for purely personal, non-governmental reasons. The state can, and should, deal with such crime. Section 242 comes into play only if the object of the murder . . . [arose from some] purpose stemming from the official position of those committing the homicide.

Under the defendants' theory, the portions of the Senate and House reports which specifically place damage actions within the reach of § 1391(e) are meaningless.[16] The only actions they believe that language contemplates are actions

> such as those against tax collectors which are against the government official in his "personal" capacity, not his official capacity . . . since otherwise they would be barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity.

Reply memorandum of defendants Colby, Schlesinger, Cushman and Walters, at 10. However, the legislative history specifically removes actions against tax collectors from the reach of § 1391(e):

> The committee also approved an amendment to section 2 of the bill providing that the provision with respect to venue should apply only to the extent that is not otherwise provided by law. Examples of such proceedings covered by this provision are proceedings with respect to federal taxes.

S.Rep.No.1992, *supra*, 4; U.S.Code Cong. and Adm.News, *supra*, at 2787. Defendants have not suggested damage actions other than the clearly-excluded tax refund actions to which Congress might have been addressing itself.

In essence, defendants attempt to break down the fiction which authorizes both injunctive relief and damages against federal officers when such relief would not be available against the United States. As Defendant Helms puts it:

---

16. "The venue problem also arises in an action against a Government official seeking damages from him for actions which are claimed to be without legal authority but which were taken by the official in the course of performing his duty."

H.Rep.No.536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess., at 3; S.Rep.No.1992, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess., at 3.

> Plaintiffs would have this Court believe that a suit against a defendant "individually" is the *equivalent* of a suit against that defendant for actions "under color of legal authority." This contention defies common sense and English usage. Plaintiffs themselves admit that Section 1391(e) covers only suits which would otherwise be unconsented suits against the sovereign, but which are maintainable against Federal officials as nominal defendants through a "fiction". But, a suit against a former officer, seeking damages from his personal estate, is the very antithesis of a suit against the Government. Thus Plaintiffs' own analysis of Section 1391(e) proves the inapplicability of the provision here.

To the contrary, permitting damage suits against officers "individually" for harm resulting from actions accomplished under color of the government's legal authority tracks precisely the methodology adopted in *Ex Parte Young, supra,* and subsequent cases. Such suits enable citizens to remedy harms to them and to deter government officials in the future from misusing the legal authority entrusted to them. The legislative history of § 1391(e) is replete with reference to precisely these concerns. The result is not inequitable. If defendants can establish a good-faith defense, it will be available to them. However, should they be unable to establish such a defense, it would be a serious injustice to throw up hurdles against a lawsuit in a single, convenient forum which Congress has authorized as a "readily available, inexpensive judicial remed[y] for the citizen who is aggrieved by the workings of government" S.Rep.1992, *supra,* at 3.[17]

---

17. Defendant Cotter argues that there is no need to look to the legislative history of § 1391(e) because the statute is clear on its face. He contends that resort to the legislative history, and an attempt to construe the subsection in light of Congressional intent, is particu-

3. *Section 1391(e) Applies to Former Officials*

[8] As a critical portion of their argument to avoid the Court's jurisdiction, defendants who were employed by the United States in the past, but who were no longer employed by the United States at the time they were served with process in this suit,[18] maintain that § 1391(e) does not apply to former federal officials but only to officials who were employed by the United States at the time they were served with process in this suit. The arguments they make persuaded Judge Renfrew, in a similar case involving many of the same defendants, to hold that § 1391(e) applied solely to present, not former, officials. *Kipperman* v. *Mc Cone,* 422 F.Supp. 860, 876-77 (N.D.Cal.1976).

Judge Renfrew began by noting that the plain language of the statute denotes "an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority." The court then pro-

---

larly inappropriate since the "literal" reading he offers will, he asserts, leave plaintiff with appropriate forums for this lawsuit in the Southern District of New York, the site of the mail openings, and the Eastern District of Virginia, headquarters of the CIA. Whether or not jurisdiction over all defendants would exist in those forums now, it is relevant in deciding what Congress intended by passing § 1391(e), that when § 1391(e) was enacted, this lawsuit could not have been brought in either of them. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (1962 ed.). Although courts have disagreed about the proper construction of § 1391(e), they have been virtually unanimous in agreeing that the statute is not clear on its face, and required a resort to legislative history. *See e.g., Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *TVA,* 459 F.2d 255, 257-59 (2d Cir. 1972); *Powelton Civil Home Own. Ass'n.* v. *Department of Housing and Urban Development,* 284 F.Supp. 809, 833 (1968).

18. Those defendants are Raborn, Carter, Taylor, White, Bissell, Karamessines, Angleton, Hood, Rocca, Osborn, Murphy, Day, O'Brien, Watson, Blount, Klassen, Cotter, Gray, Mitchell, Bundy, and O'Brien. Defendant Kirkpatrick is a former official but is a resident of Rhode Island. Defendants Helms, Schlessinger, Colby, Meyer, Ober, Walters and Kelley are, or were at the time they were served, employees of the United States.

ceeded to the legislative history which it found decisive, suggesting "no intent on the part of Congress to include former officials among those subject to suit under Section 1391(e)". *Id.* at 876. As Judge Renfrew read the legislative history, only those individuals subject to mandamus—present officials—would fall within the scope of the subsection. He found it "inconceivable that Congress would so substantially broaden the venue provision applicable to every individual once employed by the federal government without comment". *Id.*, at 877.[19]

The *Kipperman* court's decision regarding the reach of § 1391(e) is squarely in conflict with the decision in *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney*, 401 F.Supp. 952 (S.D.N.Y.1975). Lowenstein sought declaratory and injunctive relief and damages from various present and former officials for their alleged improper and unlawful conduct toward him, consisting of, *inter alia*, improper investigations, and a politically motivated IRS investigation. In response to the motions of various defendants to dismiss because § 1391(e) did not apply to former officials, the court canvassed the legislative history of § 1391(e), and then stated:

> The actions complained of by the plaintiff clearly were committed "under color of legal authority". To assert that because the defendants are no longer in government service the plaintiff may not utilize section 1391(e)—a section clearly intended to permit such actions—would as plaintiff contends, defeat the purposes of the statute. If the defendants desire to invoke official immunity, they may do so directly. *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney, supra*, at 962.

This Court is persuaded that the holding of *Lowenstein* more fully conforms to the policies behind the adoption of

---

19. In *Wu* v. *Keeney*, 384 F.Supp. 1161 (D.D.C. 1974), a damage action where jurisdiction was based on § 1391(e) was dismissed solely on this ground.

the broadened venue and service provisions of § 1391(e) than the holding in *Kipperman*.

First, the reasoning urged by defendants would permit an official to defeat an action against him for illegal acts accomplished under color of legal authority merely by resigning his position. *See Lowenstein* v. *Rooney, supra*, at 961.[20] And such reasoning creates its own difficulties with regard to officials who, while still in government service, have changed jobs.

Second, it seems clear that Congress intended by § 1391 (e) to facilitate private suits for redress of governmental action. Yet defendants' construction would require plaintiffs seeking relief to maintain multiple lawsuits in widely scattered jurisdictions, each involving the same facts and issues. That result seems at odds with the Congressional intent in enacting Section 1391(e), "a plaintiff's provision", *Powelton Civil Home Owners Ass'n.* v. *Dept. of Housing and Urban Dev., supra* at 833.

The final reason advanced by defendants against reading § 1391(e) as applying to former officials is that it would unduly burden government service. As the *Kipperman* court observed:

> The construction urged by plaintiff would potentially subject a retired government official to suit in any federal court in the country . . . The Court finds it inconceivable that Congress would so substantially broaden the venue provision applicable to every individual once employed by the federal government without comment. *Kipperman* v. *McCone, supra*, at 877.

However, since it is undisputed that Congress subjected *present* government officials to suit in any federal court

20. Plaintiff points out that defendant Cotter resigned the same month this lawsuit was filed.

under § 1391(e), it is necessary to determine exactly how much of an added burden the construction proferred by plaintiffs would place on retired officials. The Court must ascertain the Congressional intention in § 1391(e). If the plaintiff's construction would entail a significant added burden on government service, that would be persuasive reason to conclude that Congress would not have taken such a step without comment.[21]

The Court has examined defendants' arguments and fails to perceive any significant burden of federal service *added* by construing § 1391(e) to apply to former officials. Certainly personal liability itself is not such an added burden, since government service is already burdened with personal liability beyond the reach of official immunity. *See, e. g., Halperin* v. *Kissinger,* 424 F.Supp. 838 (D.D.C.1976). Neither Congress nor the courts have found that subjecting government officials to such liability impedes the proper functioning of the government. To the extent that such liability deters wrongful acts, that of course is its purpose. Nor does the Court believe that able men and women would be deterred from entering federal service if their liability were not terminated by their withdrawal from the government. Few men or women know how long they will be in government service when they enter: the interest in cutting off liability is served by statutes of limitations, which fairly mitigate such burdens as exist for all officials, in or out of government.

Nor does the Court find significant added burdens on federal service in defending such lawsuits. As plaintiff

21. For example. Defendant Bundy contends that construing § 1391(e) to include former government officials would "be patently unfair and would impose an impossible burden on government service". Bundy Memorandum at 10. He argues that plaintiff's construction would deter able men from entering federal service. Id. at 13.

points out, the principal burden of defending any lawsuit is the expense of counsel. But it seems to be undisputed that it is the policy of the Justice Department to defend lawsuits against present and former officials by citizens claiming redress for actions accomplished under color of legal authority. The record here shows that the Justice Department has retained private counsel to represent each of the defendants.[22] Indeed, this palpable manifestation of the continuing relationship between the government and its former officials strengthens plaintiffs' argument, and demonstrates the continuing responsibility which the United States bears for acts committed under color of law by persons formerly in the service of government. As for other burdens of defending the lawsuit, apart from counsel and ultimate liability, it is clear that these are insignificant. By far the greatest portion of effort required in defending this lawsuit will not require defendants to travel or undertake other actions interfering with their ongoing activities.

Since the Court cannot find significant burdens placed on former employees in defending lawsuits such as these under government expense, other than those burdens which employees of the government are all aware they face (i.e., liability for wrongful acts accomplished by misuse of official power), it agrees with the *Lowenstein* court that the proper construction of § 1391(e) renders it applicable to present and former officials alike.

---

22. A press release issued by the Department of Justice on December 12, 1975, and attached to plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the Complaint, states:

> The Department . . . usually would represent all the present and former employees for actions they took while federal officials.

Since the Department has been conducting a criminal investigation of the mail-opening program, representation of these defendants would have created a conflict of interest, and the government decided instead to retain private counsel for each of the defendants here.

Venue under Section 1391(e)

[9] The arguments defendants make concerning § 1391 (e)'s inapplicability to damage actions against former officials apply to venue as well as to personal jurisdiction. Since the Court holds that § 1391(e) authorizes the exercise of personal jurisdiction in light of the allegations in the complaint, it necessarily holds that § 1391(e) supplies venue as well.[23]

Specificity of Allegations

[10] Various defendants contend that the complaint fails to allege specific facts connecting them with Rhode Island. The case they rely on, *Socialist Workers' Party* v. *Attorney General of the United States*, 375 F.Supp. 318 (S.D.N.Y. 1974) holds that New York's long-arm statute requires a plaintiff suing an out-of-state defendant under a conspiracy theory to allege "definite evidentiary facts" connecting the defendant to transactions occurring in New York to subject him to New York jurisdiction. *Id.* at 322.

Since the Court holds that Rhode Island's long-arm statute provides no limitation on the court's exercise of jurisdiction over defendants sued pursuant to § 1391(e), the *Socialist Workers* case is inapposite. Plaintiffs have pleaded the only forum-related activity which they must plead to establish personal jurisdiction: activity within the forum, i. e., the United States.

To the extent that defendants contend that the complaint fails properly to allege sufficiently specific facts regarding

23. Plaintiffs have also sought to ground jurisdiction on Rhode Island's long-arm statute, Section 9-5-33, Rhode Island General Laws (1956), basing venue on 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). However, since the Court has found jurisdiction and venue for all plaintiffs under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), and since Rhode Island's long-arm statute could ground jurisdiction at most for plaintiff Driver, the Court does not reach these issues.

acts of defendants which have harmed plaintiffs, a different question is presented.[24] The Court has already indicated its intention to entertain motions under Rule 12(b)(6) at a later date.

Motion to Dismiss of Defendant Kelley

[11] Plaintiffs seek injunction "enjoining the defendants from engaging in the activities declared to be illegal and unconstitutional" against Defendant Clarence Kelley, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and

> A mandatory injunction or writ of mandamus ordering the defendants to produce before this Court for destruction, all files, reports, records, photographs, data computer tapes and cards, and all other materials derived from defendants' illegal and unconstitutional activities relating to plaintiffs and all other persons similarly situated. (Prayer for Relief C. 2nd Amended Complaint)

Defendant moves to dismiss on grounds of mootness, claiming that the challenged operation was terminated in 1973. They rely on an affidavit of Vernon A. Walters and on the Report to the President by the Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States (hereinafter "the Rockefeller Report").

It is clear that the plaintiffs' claim for mandatory injunctive relief, at least, is very much alive, and that Defendant Kelley is the only defendant against whom such

---

24. The court in *Kipperman* v. *McCone*, 422 F.Supp. 860 (N.D.Cal.1976) seems to have considered the Rockefeller Report as a source of "definite evidentiary fact" for the purpose of ruling on preliminary jurisdictional motions. This court does not decide now whether or not it may consider the Rockefeller Report of the Select Committee in ruling on whether or not plaintiffs have sufficiently stated a claim against particular defendants in order to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss.

relief could be awarded. They contend that copies of their first-class mail, opened by defendants, remain in FBI files. If true, that would amount to a continuing, real and substantial controversy with Defendant Kelley. The action is therefore not moot. *Aetna Life Insurance Co.* v. *Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 240-41, 57 S.Ct. 461, 81 L.Ed. 617 (1937). *See also DeFunis* v. *Odegaard*, 416 U.S. 312, 318, 94 S.Ct. 1704, 40 L.Ed.2d 164 (1974). The motion to dismiss of Defendant Kelley is denied.[25]

Interlocutory Appeal

[12] Finally, it seems apparent that the Court's resolution of the difficult jurisdictional questions before it involves a controlling question of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion, and that an immediate appeal may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation. As the opinion demonstrates, various federal courts have come out on different sides of nearly every issue regarding the reach of § 1391(e) faced by this Court. Furthermore, if the Court's resolution of these questions is mistaken, in all likelihood this action would be terminated in this Court. The Court therefore makes the certification required by 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) as to the denial of the motions to dismiss of all the defendants except for Clarence Kelley and the United States.

25. Plaintiff also claims that injunctive relief might well be appropriate even if the mail opening program has ended. While injunctive relief is normally predicated only on a threat of imminent irreparable harm, it has been held that in extraordinary cases egregious past harm, as to which the danger of repetition has not been removed, and which continues to have serious repercussions in the community, warrants the grant of injunctive relief. *Lankford* v. *Gelsten*, 364 F.2d 197, 204 (4th Cir. 1966). *See also Rizzo* v. *Goode*, 423 U.S. 362, 373 n. 8, 96 S.Ct. 598, 46 L.Ed2d 561 (1976). Since the Court finds the case not moot as to Defendant Kelley on other grounds, it need not consider whether the very serious acts complained of here meet the *Lankford* test.

Class Action

[13] Plaintiffs, who seek declaratory and injunctive relief and money damages, move the Court to certify a class composed of

> [A]ll United States citizens and residents whose first-class letters, written and sent by or to them, either from within or destined for the United States, were unlawfully opened, read and photographed by employees of the Central Intelligence Agency, acting in concert with employees of the United States Post Office Department, the United States Postal Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and other government agencies resulting in the unlawful collection, maintenance and dissemination of files relating to them.

Defendants oppose class certification on a variety of grounds. At the threshold, they object to the conclusory terms in which the class is defined—those whose mail has been "unlawfully" opened, read, and photographed. In view of the fact that the same representation can be achieved by a class composed of "those whose mail has been opened, read, and photographed in connection with the East Coast Mail Intercept Program", the Court sustains defendants' objection; plaintiffs are directed to modify the definition of the proposed class accordingly.

[14] In addition to problems raised by defendants, the Court has its own liminal problems with the class as currently defined. It became clear at the hearing held on this matter that beneath the surface of the broad class that plaintiffs seek to represent there exist two well-defined subclasses. On the one hand, there are those persons whose mail was, according to the Rockefeller Report, opened, photographed or otherwise tampered with on a purely random

basis. This sub-class apparently numbers in the tens of thousands. *See* Rockefeller Report 105. On the other hand, there is a smaller group, consisting of different individuals over the years, but averaging about three hundred persons at any one time, *see* Rockefeller Report 105. This sub-class is composed of persons on the so-called "watch-list", individuals of particular interest to one or more of the nation's intelligence bodies whose mail was the object of special scrutiny. See id. at 105, 111. The two groups are in markedly different positions. By definition, the watch-list sub-class had its mail surveilled for some reason, although what the reason was in each case remains to be seen. The random sub-class, on the other had, had its mail inspected for reasons of pure chance. Whether the different positions of the two groups will have any legal significance, the Court cannot now say. It is clear, however, that there are significant practical differences between the two groups, in terms of litigating this case. For example, defendants have already indicated that they believe that they had probable cause to inspect the mail of the persons on the watch-list. Proving this claim could involve extensive discovery by defendants, involving depositions from each watch-listed class member. It could also involve the presentation of an individual defense against each such person. By contrast, the "probable cause" defense would obviously be unavailable with respect to persons whose mail was randomly opened. In view of these differences between the two groups, the Court deems it appropriate that the class be divided into two sub-classes, composed of the random group and the watch-list group respectively.[26] *See* Fed.R.Civ.P.

26. Because the decision to create sub classes is made on the Court's own motion and only after the hearing on class determination, the Court has not been informed whether named plaintiffs fall into the random sub-class, the watch-list sub-class or both. This information

23(c)(4)(B); *Eisen* v. *Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 184-85, 94 S.Ct. 2140, 40 L.Ed.2d 732 (1974) (Douglas J., dissenting in part). Rule 23(c)(4) requires the Court, once such a division has been made, to construe and apply the remaining provisions of Rule 23 accordingly. It is to that task that the Court now turns.

A. *The Requirements of Rule 23(a)*

Rule 23(a) provides:

> (a) *Prerequisites to a Class Action.* One or more members of a class may sue or be sued as representative parties on behalf of all only if (1) the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, (2) there are questions of law or fact common to the class, (3) the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class, and (4) the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

[15] As to the random sub-class, the Court has no difficulty in finding that the requirements of Rule 23(a) are satisfied. The class of persons whose mail was randomly opened numbers in the tens of thousands, *see* Rockefeller Report 105. The claims of plaintiffs (that their mail was randomly opened in violation of the fourth amendment) as well as the defense (that the mail intercept program was undertaken reasonably and in good faith) are typical class wide. The mail intercept program, as a whole, raises common questions of fourth amendment law that do not vary

---

should be furnished to the Court without delay, by stipulation or otherwise. It will be necessary that at least one plaintiff be a member of each sub-class before an order of certification can issue. *See Sosna* v. *Iowa*, 419 U.S. 393, 403, 95 S.Ct. 553, 42 L.Ed.2d 532 (1975).

perceptibly according to which random class member raises these questions. Further, there is no doubt that plaintiffs' attorneys from the American Civil Liberties Union are amply qualified to carry this action forward as a class action, thus assuring "adequacy of representation" in one sense of that term, *see Cullen* v. *United States*, 372 F.Supp., 441, 447-48 (N.D.Ill.1974).

[16] However, "adequacy of representation" also means that "the interests of the representative party must coincide with those of the class", *Mersay* v. *First Republic Corp.*, 43 F.R.D. 465, 469 (S.D.N.Y.1968). It has been suggested by one of the defendants that this requirement is not met in the present case because some persons whose mail was monitored might regard the East Coast Mail Intercept Project as entirely reasonable and in the national interest. This assertion, if true, is irrelevant to the question of whether this action may be maintained as a class action. *See Norwalk CORE* v. *Norwalk Redevelopment Agency*, 395 F.2d 920, 937 (2nd Cir. 1968). If the relief sought in this case would adversely affect tangible interests of some proposed class members it might be argued that plaintiffs were not adequate representatives of the class. *See, e. g., Dierks* v. *Thompson*, 414 F.2d 453, 456 (1st Cir. 1969); *Burns* v. *United States Postal Service*, 380 F. Supp. 623, 629 (S.D. N.Y.1974). However, such an argument cannot be based on mere speculation as to what some class members might regard as sound national policy, and the Court finds that plaintiffs provide the adequacy of representation for the interest of the proposed sub-class that is required by Rule 23(a).

[17] The issues posed by the question whether the watch-list sub-class meets the requirements of Rule 23(a) are somewhat different. There is no problem as to numeros-

ity. Although the total number of persons on the list over a twenty-year period has not been ascertained, the average number of persons on the list at any given time was about 300, *see* Rockefeller Report 106, a number in itself sufficient to render joinder impracticable. *Cf. Cullen* v. *United States*, 372 F.Supp. 441, 447 (joinder of 325 persons clearly impracticable). As to adequacy of representation, the Court's earlier remarks *a propos* the random sub-class apply to the watch-list sub-class with equal vigor, and the Court finds adequacy of representation as to that group.

The more difficult question is whether any of the named plaintiffs present claims that are typical of the class and raise issues involving common questions of law or fact. Basically, defendants contend that the legality of the surveillance of watch-listed persons depends on the particular facts of each case, as those facts shed light on the reasonableness of each intercept. Such individualized determinations, defendants argue, are the very antithesis of the typicality and common questions required by Rule 23(a). This argument does not really address plaintiffs' theory of the case.

In plaintiffs' view, a warrantless surveillance of *any* first-class mail for intelligence purposes is presumptively illegal under *any* circumstances. If this view is correct—and now is not the time to make a judgment on that point, *see Yaffe* v. *Powers*, 454 F.2nd 1362, 1366 and n. 2 (1st Cir. 1972); *Fogel* v. *Wolfgang*, 47 F.R.D. 213, 215 n. 4 (S.D.N.Y. 1969)—than plaintiffs are also correct in asserting that the myriad targets of the intercept program have a unitary claim whose validity is dependent upon a single question of law. Should it become clear that plaintiffs' view of the law will not prevail the sub-class can be modified or dismissed. *See Yaffe* v. *Powers*, 454 F.2d at 1367. For the present, the Court finds that the requirements of typicality and com-

monality, as well as numerosity and adequacy of representation are present with respect to the watch-list subclass.

B. *The requirements of Rule 23(b)*

[18] In addition to the requirements of Rule 23(a), plaintiffs must satisfy one or more of the requirements of Rule 23(b) in order to obtain class certification. It is plaintiffs' position that the instant action may be maintained under any of the following provisions of Rule 23(b):

> (b) *Class Actions Maintainable.* An action may be maintained as a class action if the prerequisites of subdivision (a) are satisfied, and in addition:
>
> (1) the prosecution of separate actions by or against individual members of the class would create a risk of
>
> (A) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the party opposing the class, or . . .
>
> . . . . .
>
> (2) the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole; or
>
> (3) the court finds that the questions of law or fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. The matters pertinent to the findings include: (A) the interest of members of the class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions; (B) the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy

> already commenced by or against members of the class; (C) the desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; (D) the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

While disputing generally that the requirements of any portion of Rule 23(b) have been met, defendants urge in particular that plaintiffs cannot properly bring this action under Rule 23(b)(2) since, in addition to injunctive relief, plaintiffs seek money damages in excess of $1 billion and Rule 23(b)(2), by its terms is applicable only to claims for "final injunctive or corresponding declaratory relief." Without disputing plaintiffs' contention that "incidental" monetary relief can be given in conjunction with injunctive or declaratory relief under Rule 23(b)(2), it seems to the Court beyond dispute that plaintiffs' attempts to impose substantial financial liability on defendants cannot fairly be characterized as "incidental." *See, e. g. Robertson* v. *National Basketball Association,* 389 F.Supp. 867, 900 (S.D. N.Y.1975); Advisory Committee's Notes to Rule 23, 39 F.R.D. 98, 102 (1966).

[19] However, this is not to say that a claim for class-wide injunctive relief should be denied merely because it is coupled with a claim for a money judgment, however substantial. In order to preserve injunctive relief, the better course, in this Court's view, is to certify the declaratory and injunctive claims for class-wide relief under Rule 23(b)(2) if the requirements of that rule and of Rule 23(a) are met and then consider as a separate matter whether the claims for money damages can be maintained under Rule 23(b)(1) or Rule 23(b)(3). See 3B Moore's Federal Practice ¶ 23.45 [1] at 708-09.

In the present case, it is clear that if plaintiffs prevail on the merits and satisfy the other requirements for decla-

ratory and injunctive relief, such relief can be appropriately granted on a class-wide basis, both with respect to the watch-list sub-class and the random sub-class. As to the random sub-class, such relief, if it is to be granted to any member of the group, should be granted to all, since the very definition of the sub-class belies any individual differences among its members and defendants' decision to institute random mail surveillance was based on the common factor of the destination of the mail surveilled rather than upon any particularizing characteristics of individual addresses.

As to the watch-list sub-class, defendants claim to have acted on the basis that surveillance of persons in that group was reasonably justified. Should that assumption prove erroneous *in toto*, class-wide relief will be appropriate. Should the assumption be upheld in its entirety, defendants will be entitled to a judgment in their favor running against the sub-class as a whole. If the validity of defendants' "reasonableness" standard must be tested on a case-by-case basis, the sub-class can be dismissed as improvidently certified. *See, e. g. City of Philadelphia* v. *Emhart Corp.*, 50 F.R.D. 232, 235 (E.D.Pa.1970). At this juncture, the common thread of "reasonableness," generally applicable to the entire sub-class, is sufficient to permit certification of the watch-list sub-class under Rule 23(b)(2) for purposes of seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.[27]

[20] It remains to be determined whether plaintiffs' claims for money damages are amenable to class treatment.

---

27. Defendants have argued that appropriate injunctive relief may be framed in this case without certifying a class. *See e. g., District of Columbia Podiatry Society* v. *District of Columbia*, 65 F.R.D. 113 (D.D.C.1974). This Court, however, will follow what it regards as the better rule, that, at least in civil rights cases, certification for purposes of injunctive relief is appropriate wherever the requirements of Rule 23 have been met. *See, e. g., Fujishima* v. *Board of Education*, 460 F.2d 1355, 1360 (7th Cir. 1972).

More precisely, the Court must consider whether plaintiffs can maintain a class action on the issue of liability for money damages, for the Court rejects at the outset plaintiffs' contention that the actual assessment of damages to individual class members can be tried on a class-wide basis. As defendants accurately point out, the gravamen of plaintiffs' damages claim is that the privacy of persons whose mail was monitored has been violated. How much compensation, if any, such persons are entitled to is necessarily a matter that the jury must assess on a case by case basis, assessing the harm done in each case. Plaintiffs' suggestion that a dollar amount can be arbitrarily assigned as compensation for each letter opened or photographed cannot be accepted. *Dellums* v. *Powell,* No. 1022-71 (D.D.C.), *appeal pending,* a case cited by plantiffs in which classwide damages for constitutional violations were awarded, did not involve the uniquely subjective claims of privacy that are implicated when, as here, a fourth amendment violation is claimed.

In deciding the question of whether a class action on the issue of liability can be maintained by either of the subclasses, a threshold problem arises that is not present if the claims for relief were limited to declaratory and injunctive relief.

The problem, although identified by defendants as related to the question of whether plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the class sought to be represented, might also be described as one of standing. To the extent that plaintiffs seek class-wide declaratory and injunctive relief, there can be little doubt as to their standing. Plaintiffs allege that they and all other class members have been the victims of a government program that has violated their constitutional and statutory rights and seek a declaration that the program was illegal, an injunction against its continuance, and

a mandatory order that the files kept as a result of the program be destroyed. Insofar as this relief can be obtained from the present governmental officials who are parties to this suit, it is clear that plaintiffs have standing to seek this relief on behalf of the class. The harm that the named plaintiffs allege is the same as that of the two subclasses generally: it is the threatened continuation of the program and the continued existence in government files of the information gleaned by the program.

The claims on liability for money damages stand on a somewhat different footing.[28] Plaintiffs seek money damages on behalf of the class from each of the officials responsible for the mail intercept program throughout the twenty year period of its existence even though their own individual mail was only allegedly tampered with during a part of that period. The question is thus raised as to how plaintiff Driver, for example, whose mail was allegedly opened in 1965 and 1969, can have standing to seek damages from defendant Schlesinger, for example, whose involvement in the intercept program, by plaintiffs' own allegations, did not begin until after 1970; or against defendant Bissell, whose tenure with the CIA extended from 1959 only until 1962. Courts have resolved this question in various ways, some holding that class representation is not possible under such circumstances, *see, e.g., Weiner* v. *Bank of King of Prussia*, 358 F.Supp. 684 (E.D.Pa.1973); *see also La Mar* v. *H & B Novelty & Loan Co.*, 489 F.2d 461 (9th Cir. 1973) (lack of typicality). On the other hand, at least one court

28. It is not clear from plaintiffs' complaint whether they seek an injunction against former CIA, FBI, and post office personnel or a declaration that these former officials' conduct was illegal. If such relief is indeed sought, it raises the same standing problems as does the claim for monetary relief and the Court's discussion of that point applies equally to claims for declaratory and injunctive relief against former officials.

has held that a class action is maintainable even where plaintiffs would be unable in their own right to bring an action against all of the defendants. *Haas* v. *Pittsburgh National Bank*, 60 F.R.D. 604, 611-614 (W.D.Pa. 1973).

This Court need not attempt to resolve these conflicting positions, since it appears that the rule that one or more of the named plaintiffs must individually have a cause of action against each named defendant in order for a class action to be maintained does not apply to "situations in which all injuries are the result of a conspiracy" or to "instances in which all defendants are juridically related in a manner that suggests a single resolution of the dispute would be expeditious." *La Mar*, 489 F.2d at 466.

[21] In the Court's opinion, plaintiffs' complaint fits both branches of the *La Mar* exception. Plaintiffs' complaint alleges a massive and concerted program of covert mail intercepts over a twenty-year period, the maintenance of on-going files based on information gleaned from the intercepts, and a conspiracy to conceal the existence of the entire operation. The officials and former officials named are, moreover, juridically related in that they are all past and present federal officials whose duties included oversight either of foreign or domestic intelligence gathering or the proper delivery of the U. S. Mail. These considerations fit the present complaint easily within the *La Mar* exception. *See also Washington* v. *Lee*, 263 F.Supp. 327, 330-31 (M.D. Ala.1966) (plaintiffs segregated by race in one county jail can represent class of similarly situated persons in all county jails throughout state). Accordingly, the Court holds that named plaintiffs who are members of the two sub-classes have standing to raise the claims of the members of their respective sub-class against former officials whose tenure does not correspond to the dates of the individual mail openings alleged by any of the named plaintiffs.

The Court now turns to the question of whether a class-wide claim that defendants' conduct has rendered them liable in damages fits either of the two remaining sections of Rule 23(b) suggested by plaintiffs.

It seems clear that Rule 23(b)(1)(A) cannot apply to the liability claim. Assuming that Rule 23(b)(1)(A) is applicable to claims for damages, a question not free from doubt, *see, e.g., Kristiansen* v. *John Mullens & Sons, Inc.*, 59 F.R.D. 99, 105 and n. 6 (E.D.N.Y. 1973); *Ratner* v. *Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.*, 54 F.R.D. 412, 415 and n. 5 (S.D.N.Y. 1972); *but see Berman* v. *Narragansett Racing Association*, 48 F.R.D. 333, 337 (D.R.I.1969) (by implication) the rule is inapposite to the present facts. The plaintiffs argue that Rule 23(b)(1)(A) certification is necessary to establish compatible "standards of conduct for the party opposing the class." However, the Court's decision to certify the sub-classes under Rule 23(b)(2) for class-wide injunctive relief has accomplished this for it will necessarily mean that a class-wide adjudication will be forthcoming (unless the class is de-certified) that will establish a standard of conduct to be observed by defendants in the future and will preclude any need for the establishment of such a standard by means of a damages action under Rule 23(b)(1)(A).

There remains Rule 23(b)(3). In order for plaintiffs to maintain a class action on the issue of liability on behalf of either sub-class, the Court must find that common questions of law and fact predominate over individual questions and that "a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair adjudication of the controversy." Rule 23 (b)(3).

[22] Insofar as plaintiffs seek a class-wide adjudication of defendants' liability on behalf of the random sub-class, there is little doubt that such treatment is warranted. The Court has already determined to make a class-wide adjudi-

cation of the legality of the intercept program under Rule 23(b)(2). Adjudication of the issue of liability will add only the element of any good faith or other defense that defendants choose to raise. Since the random sub-class members are completely fungible, having been selected by chance and the accident that they all corresponded with persons in the Soviet Union, it cannot be said that the validity of any defenses raised will vary from individual to individual, or that any individual class member will have any special interest in controlling his or her individual litigation. Judicial economy, the prevention of multiple lawsuits, the absence of any substantial difficulty in concentrating this litigation in this forum—all of these factors lend additional support to the Court's conclusion that defendants' liability to the random sub-class should be adjudicated as a class action.

[23] Application of the Rule 23(b)(3) criteria to the watch-list sub-class leads to a quite different conclusion. Defendants have made it clear that they plan to defend against liability for the mail surveillance of watch-listed persons on the grounds that they reasonably believed that each such surveillance was proper. When the Court considers the extensive pre-trial discovery and trial testimony that such a defense will entail, it must conclude that the question of the manageability of such a class action raised by defendants is no mere spectre, and poses serious problems that render class action certification of the watch-list sub-class on the question of defendants' liability inappropriate at this time.[29]

---

29. Two reasons dictate a different result concerning certification under Rule 23(b)(3) of a class action an behalf of the watch-list subclass with respect to the issue of liability than was reached with respect to certification under Rule 23(b)(2) for the claims for declaratory and injunctive relief. First, the "good-faith" defense,

C. *Notice*

[24] Because the liability issue in this case will proceed as a Rule 23(b)(3) class action on behalf of the sub-class of persons whose mail was randomly photographed, opened, or inspected in connection with the East Coast Mail Intercept Program, notice to members of the sub-class is required by Rule 23(c)(2). This notice must include individual notice to sub-class members if the addresses of the individuals are available through reasonable effort. *Eisen* v. *Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 173, 94 S.Ct. 2140, 40 L.Ed.2d 732 (1974). Whether the addresses are available in the present case can only be determined after discovery proceedings, and the Court will enter an appropriate order regarding notice at that time. It should be noted that whatever notice is ordered must be at plaintiffs' expense. *Id.* at 178-179, 94 S.Ct. 2140. Plaintiffs' contention that the government should bear the cost of notice in this case cannot be sustained under *Eisen*. While the *Eisen* Court left open the possibility that defendants may be made to bear the cost of notice where there exists a fiduciary relationship between plaintiff and defendants, plaintiffs have not established that such a relationship exists between plaintiffs and defendants in the present case.

[25] One final comment is in order. Defendants, citing *Berlin Democratic Club* v. *Rumsfeld*, 410 F Supp. 144 (D.D.C.1976), argue that maintenance of a class action in this case will lead to endless procedural battles over dis-

---

with its concomitant problems is obviously not available insofar as the relief sought is declaratory and injunctive. Second, and controlling, "the existence of 'predominating' questions and the availability of other methods of resolution which might be superior to a class action are not criteria of a subdivision (b)(2) class, but . . . of a (b)(3) class . . . ." *Yaffe* v. *Powers*, 454 F.2d 1362, 1366 (1st Cir. 1972).

covery and impermissible inquiries into the nature and scope of intelligence activity. The latter objection, whatever its validity in other cases, is inapplicable to the present case, where the East Coast Mail Intercept Program is already a matter of detailed public knowledge due to the publication of the Rockefeller Report and the Report of the Select Committee. The existence of those reports should also preclude many objections to discovery that might otherwise be made. In any case, plaintiffs here have raised a class-wide claim for injunctive and declaratory relief that they seek to certify under Rule 23(b)(2) as well as claims for class-wide damages under Rule 23(b)(3). While considerations of undue publicity might conceivably have some bearing on the determination the Court must make under Rule 23(b)(3) as to whether a class action is superior to other modes of adjudication, no such determination is authorized under Rule 23(b)(2). Since the same information will undoubtedly be sought in discovery whether the relief sought is injunctive and declaratory only or is coupled with claims for money damages, defendants' objections on grounds of undue publicity must be rejected.

To summarize, the Court finds that plaintiffs' proposed class of all United States citizens whose mail was unlawfully opened, read, and photographed must be amended to avoid the conclusory term "unlawfully," that the class must be divided into sub-classes composed of those persons whose mail was opened, read, and photographed randomly and those persons whose mail was opened, read, and photographed based on their presence on the watch-list, that at least one named plaintiff must be a member of each subclass, that a class action may be certified as to both subclasses under Rule 23(b)(2) for purposes of adjudicating the claims for injunctive and declaratory relief, that a class

action on behalf of the random sub-class may be certified under Rule 23(b)(3) for purposes of adjudicating the claim that defendants are liable in damages to the members of that sub-class, that class certification of the liability claims of the watch-list sub-class is inappropriate at this time, and that individual notice of the class action on the issue of liability must be sent at plaintiffs' expense to all members of the random sub-class whose addresses are obtainable through reasonable effort.

Counsel will prepare an order in accordance with this opinion.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
SEP 22 1978
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD HELMS, ET AL.,

Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

Of Counsel:
COLE AND
GRONER, P.C.

WALTER H. FLEISCHER
ALFRED F. BELCUORE
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Ober

Of Counsel:
SCHWALB &
DONNENFELD

CHARLES R. DONNENFELD
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Of Counsel:
GUNNING, LA FAZIA
& GNYS, INC.

GUY J. WELLS
419 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Helms

(Additional Counsel Listed Inside Front Cover)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
AUTHORITIES CITED	i
OPINIONS BELOW	1
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED	1
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT	3
CONCLUSION	6

AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES:

Avery v. United States, 434 F.Supp. 937 (D. Conn. 1977)	5
Birnbaum v. United States, 436 F.Supp. 967 (E.D.N.Y.), *appeal docketed*, No. 77-6175, 2d Cir., Oct. 17, 1977	5
Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971)	5
Board of School Commissioners v. Jacobs, 420 U.S. 128 (1975)	6
Briggs v. Goodwin, 569 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), *petition for cert. filed sub nom. Stafford v. Briggs*, 46 U.S.L.W. 3694 (U.S. April 28, 1978) (No. 77-1546)	5
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen v. Bangor & Aroostook R.R., 389 U.S. 327 (1967)	6

AUTHORITIES CITED (Continued)

	Page
Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S. 99 (1977)	4
Driver v. United States, No. 77-C-919 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 1978)	5
East Texas Motor Freight System, Inc. v. Rodriguez, 431 U.S. 395 (1977)	6
Franks v. Bowman Transportation, Co., 424 U.S. 747 (1976)	6
Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. v. Wolf Bros. & Co., 240 U.S. 251 (1916)	6
Wheeldin v. Wheeler, 373 U.S. 647 (1963)	5
Wilson v. United States, No. 77-C-975 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 1978)	5
STATUTES:	
5 U.S.C. § 702	2
28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)	3
28 U.S.C. § 1331(a)	2
28 U.S.C. § 1339	2
28 U.S.C. § 1343	2
28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)	5
28 U.S.C. § 1361	2
28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)	*passim*
28 U.S.C. § 2676	6
MISCELLANEOUS:	
H. Rep. No. 536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1962)	4

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD HELMS, ET AL.,

Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion of the Court of Appeals (Pet. App. 1a-20a) is reported at 577 F.2d 147. The Opinion of the District Court (Pet. App. 21a-69a) is reported at 74 F.R.D. 382.

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Whether 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), although phrased to cover only certain suits against a Federal official who "is . . . acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority," provides nationwide personal jurisdiction and venue in suits against former officials or officials who no longer serve in the capacity in which they performed the acts upon which their alleged liability is based, merely because they formerly "were" acting in such a capacity.

Should certiorari be granted, Respondents would present certain additional questions; these are stated in the conditional cross-petition for a writ of certiorari filed *sub nom. Helms, et al. v. Driver, et al.*, No. 78-310.

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE

This suit was instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island by several individuals, complaining that their international mail had been opened during the period from 1953 to 1973, in a mail interception program operated by the Central Intelligence Agency. Alleging Federal jurisdiction pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 702 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331(a), 1339, 1343, and 1361, Plaintiffs sued approximately 30 individuals who are, or at various times in the last 20 years were, officials of the Post Office Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Justice, or other agencies of the Executive Branch. The essential claim of Plaintiffs is that the mail interception program violated their rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments. The suit purports to be brought against the individuals in their individual, as well as official or former official, capacities. Plaintiffs demand money damages from these Defendants personally, totaling several billion dollars.

Defendants moved to dismiss on the grounds, primarily, of lack of personal jurisdiction and proper venue, relying upon their essential lack of any personal contacts with the forum State, Rhode Island.[1] The District Court denied Defendants' motions, on the ground that 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) provided for nationwide jurisdiction, venue, and service of process over all Federal officials, past and present, for actions arising out of their Government service, in-

[1] One Defendant did not so move, because he was a resident of Rhode Island. Other Defendants moved to dismiss on grounds of lack of service of process.

cluding actions brought against them in their individual capacities. 74 F.R.D. 382 (D.R.I. 1977).

On an interlocutory appeal certified by the District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit ruled that, although § 1391(e) provides personal jurisdiction over present Federal officials sued for damages in their individual capacities, irrespective of their lack of contacts with the forum State, it does not so provide jurisdiction over former officials or officials who at the time the suit was brought were not serving the Government in the capacity in which they performed the acts upon which their alleged liability is based. 577 F.2d 147 (1st Cir. 1978).

This Brief in Opposition is filed on behalf of Defendants who at the time this action was brought no longer were employed by the Federal Government, or no longer were employed in the capacity in which they performed the acts upon which their alleged liability is based.[2]

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

Insofar as it holds that former employees of the Government and employees who no longer serve the Government in the capacity in which they allegedly took the actions that are the subject of the Complaint are not amenable to damage suits throughout the Nation under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), the decision below is clearly correct. There is no conflict among the Circuits on this issue, and no occasion for further review.

1. Petitioners do not respond to the holding of the Court of Appeals that their efforts to sue Respondents

---

[2] Richard Helms, James R. Schlesinger, Robert E. Cushman, Jr., William F. Raborn, Jr., Rufus L. Taylor, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Cord Meyer, Thomas Karamessines, Richard Ober, William Hood, James Murphy, Howard J. Osborn, Winton M. Blount, Elmer T. Klassen, L. Patrick Gray, Lawrence F. O'Brien, James J. Angleton, and Ray Rocca.

in Rhode Island are incompatible with the express terms of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e). That provision covers only civil actions in which a defendant officer "*is . . . acting* in his official capacity or under color of legal authority . . ." (emphasis added). Petitioners' position that § 1391(e) encompasses suits alleging that an officer "*was* . . . acting" in his official capacity or under color of legal authority cannot be squared with the literal words of the statute.[3]

Nor do Petitioners point to any legislative history supporting their position.

2. Primarily Petitioners contend that the Court should read § 1391(e) to serve what they deem to be its "liberal purpose" (Pet. 9), *viz.*, to make it easier for citizens to recover damages for alleged constitutional violations. It is improper to "construe" a statute to provide jurisdiction over a broad class of defendants that it does not in terms cover, based upon nothing more than such an alleged general "policy." *E.g., Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 104-07 (1977). Nor is there evidence that Congress did or would view a draconian measure subjecting every former Federal official to personal damage suits in every Federal court from Guam to the Virgin Islands as serving

---

[3] As appears from the conditional cross-petition for a writ of certiorari, filed by many of the Respondents, in No. 78-310, *Helms, et al. v. Driver, et al.*, Respondents consider that 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) does not apply at all to damage suits aimed at obtaining damages from an officer in his individual capacity. The words "is . . . acting" most naturally are read to encompass civil actions that seek to require an official to respond to a remedy in the nature of mandamus or injunction, or to obtain judicial review of action of an administrative agency, or to cause the *Government* to pay out money. Some such actions, "in essence against the United States," are "nominally brought against the official in his individual capacity" "only to circumvent what remains of the doctrine of sovereign immunity." H. Rep. No. 536, 87th Cong. 1st Sess. 4 (1962), *quoted in* the First Circuit's Opinion, 577 F.2d at 154 (Pet. App. 13a). Suits such as this, seeking substantial money damages personally from an officer, are neither "in essence" against the United States nor "nominally" brought against the officer in his individual capacity.

a "liberal" purpose. Unquestionably, Petitioners are mistaken in contending that the 1962 enactment that included § 1391(e) was designed to provide expansive jurisdiction over "constitutional tort" suits like this one. The availability of the Federal courts as a forum for such suits was not established until *Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), 9 years later. *Compare Wheeldin v. Wheeler*, 373 U.S. 647, 649-52 (1963).

3. Contrary to Petitioners' views, there is no conflict between the decision below and *Briggs v. Goodwin*, 569 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), *petition for cert. filed sub nom. Stafford v. Briggs*, 46 U.S.L.W. 3694 (U.S. April 28, 1978) (No. 77-1546). The District of Columbia Circuit did not purport to decide in *Briggs* whether "former" Government employees are within the ken of § 1391(e). There is no reason to anticipate that that Court, if directly confronted with the issue, would disagree with the First Circuit that the provision does not apply to "former" or "different capacity" officials. Nor should this Court undertake to review the issue unless and until there is clear disagreement on the point.

4. Other considerations make review at this time inappropriate. At this time four of the five named Plaintiffs have successfully sued the United States under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b), upon the very allegations of mail interception that form the basis of the present Complaint.[4] The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has under submission the question of whether such a Tort Claims suit can be maintained. *Birnbaum v. United States*, 436 F.Supp. 967 (E.D.N.Y.), *appeal docketed*, No. 77-6175, 2d Cir., Oct. 17, 1977. Should it be determined

[4] *See Wilson v. United States*, No. 77-C-975 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 1978) (Petitioner Victoria Wilson); *Driver v. United States*, No. 77-C-919 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 1978) (Petitioner Rodney D. Driver); *Avery v. United States*, 434 F.Supp. 937 (D. Conn. 1977) (Petitioner Michael Avery); *Birnbaum v. United States*, 436 F.Supp. 967 (E.D.N.Y.), *appeal docketed*, No. 77-6175, 2d Cir., Oct. 17, 1977 (Petitioner B. Leonard Avery).

that such suits are maintainable against the United States, even the questionable "policy" arguments of Petitioners would lose whatever little force they may now have.[5]

This litigation stands in an interlocutory posture. Should it not be resolved as a result of the pending Federal Tort Claims Act litigation, or should a genuine conflict among the Circuits arise, then any party dissatisfied by a final judgment again may seek to bring the issues here presented before this Court, through a petition filed after the final disposition of the case on the merits by the Court of Appeals.[6]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by Petitioners Rodney D. Driver, *et al.*, should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Of Counsel:
COLE AND
GRONER, P.C.

WALTER H. FLEISCHER
ALFRED F. BELCUORE
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Ober

Of Counsel:
SCHWALB &
DONNENFELD

CHARLES R. DONNENFELD
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

---

[5] Moreover, if they ultimately recover judgments for money damages against the United States in the Federal Tort Claims Act cases, the named Plaintiffs would thereby be barred by 28 U.S.C. § 2676 from maintaining this suit. It is unclear that their class action allegations could save this as a viable suit. *See East Texas Motor Freight System, Inc. v. Rodriguez*, 431 U.S. 395 (1977); *Franks v. Bowman Transportation, Co.*, 424 U.S. 747, 753 (1976); *Board of School Commissioners v. Jacobs*, 420 U.S. 128, 129 (1975). The District Court, in its Opinion denying Respondents' motions to dismiss, also ruled that it would certify this suit as a class action as to liability (Pet. App. 54a-69a); however, no Order to that effect has been entered.

[6] *See Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen v. Bangor & Aroostook R.R.*, 389 U.S. 327 (1967); *Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. v. Wolf Bros. & Co.*, 240 U.S. 251 (1916).

Of Counsel:
GUNNING, LA FAZIA
& GNYS, INC.

GUY J. WELLS
419 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Helms

Of Counsel:
CADWALADER,
WICKERSHAM
& TAFT

PETER MEGARGEE BROWN
EARL H. NEMSER
One Wall Street
New York, New York 10005

Of Counsel:
HINCKLEY, ALLEN,
SALISBURY &
PARSONS

GEORGE M. VETTER, JR.
2200 Industrial Bank Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondents
James R. Schlesinger,
Robert E. Cushman, Jr.

Of Counsel:
SWAN, JENCKES,
ASQUITH & DAVIS

HARRY W. ASQUITH
EDWARD W. MOSES
911 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondents
William F. Raborn, Jr., Rufus L.
Taylor, Richard M. Bissell, Jr.,
Cord Meyer, Thomas Karamessines,
James R. Murphy, William J. Hood

Of Counsel:
HIGGINS, CAVANAGH
& COONEY

JOSEPH V. CAVANAGH
600 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorney for Respondents
Howard J. Osborn, Winton M.
Blount, Elmer T. Klassen,
L. Patrick Gray, Lawrence F.
O'Brien

Of Counsel:
BREED, ABBOTT
& MORGAN

JOSEPH P. DAILEY
One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, New York 10005

Attorney for Respondent
Lawrence F. O'Brien

Of Counsel:
DUNCAN, BROWN,
WEINBERG & PALMER,
P.C.

JON T. BROWN
WALLACE L. DUNCAN
PHILIP L. CHABOT, JR.

Attorneys for Respondents
James J. Angleton
Ray Rocca

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
NOV 10 1978
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD HELMS, ET AL.,

Respondents.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

Of Counsel:
COLE AND
GRONER, P.C.

WALTER H. FLEISCHER
ALFRED F. BELCUORE
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Ober

Of Counsel:
SCHWALB &
DONNENFELD

CHARLES R. DONNENFELD
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Of Counsel:
GUNNING, LA FAZIA
& GNYS, INC.

GUY J. WELLS
419 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Helms

(Additional Counsel Listed Inside Front Cover)

Reprographics Inc., 1732 Eye St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 298-5537

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD HELMS, ET AL.,

Respondents.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

Pursuant to Rule 24(5) of this Court, Respondents Richard Helms, *et al.*,* submit this Supplemental Brief in Opposition to invite the Court's attention to the Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Lamont* v. *Haig*, No. 75-2006, decided October 16, 1978, after Respondents had filed their Brief in Opposition. That Opinion appears as an Appendix to this Supplemental Brief ("App.").

In *Lamont*, the District of Columbia Circuit expressly agreed with the decision of the First Circuit in the instant case and held that "former federal officers and employees are beyond the reach of [28 U.S.C.] Section 1391(e)"

---

* Respondents are listed in their Brief in Opposition at page 3 note 2.

(App. 15a). The District of Columbia Circuit expressly did not decide whether 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) applies to individuals who, although employed by the Federal Government at the time an action is brought, no longer are serving the Government in the capacities in which they performed acts upon which their alleged liability is based (App. 13a n.39). Thus, as stated in the Brief in Opposition, there is no conflict between the District of Columbia Circuit and the First Circuit on the issues presented by the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Of Counsel:
COLE AND
GRONER, P.C.

WALTER H. FLEISCHER
ALFRED F. BELCUORE
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Ober

Of Counsel:
SCHWALB &
DONNENFELD

CHARLES R. DONNENFELD
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Of Counsel:
GUNNING, LA FAZIA
& GNYS, INC.

GUY J. WELLS
419 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondent
Richard Helms

Of Counsel:
CADWALADER,
WICKERSHAM
& TAFT

PETER MEGARGEE BROWN
EARL H. NEMSER
One Wall Street
New York, New York 10005

Of Counsel:
HINCKLEY, ALLEN,
SALISBURY &
PARSONS

GEORGE M. VETTER, JR.
2200 Industrial Bank Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondents
James R. Schlesinger,
Robert E. Cushman, Jr.

Of Counsel:
SWAN, JENCKES,
ASQUITH & DAVIS

HARRY W. ASQUITH
EDWARD W. MOSES
911 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorneys for Respondents
William F. Raborn, Jr., Rufus L. Taylor, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Cord Meyer, Thomas Karamessines, James R. Murphy, William J. Hood

Of Counsel:
HIGGINS, CAVANAGH
& COONEY

JOSEPH V. CAVANAGH
600 Turks Head Building
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Attorney for Respondents
Howard J. Osborn, Winton M. Blount, Elmer T. Klassen, L. Patrick Gray, Lawrence F. O'Brien

Of Counsel:
BREED, ABBOTT
& MORGAN

JOSEPH P. DAILEY
One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, New York 10005

Attorney for Respondent
Lawrence F. O'Brien

Of Counsel:
DUNCAN, BROWN,
WEINBERG & PALMER,
P.C.

JON T. BROWN
WALLACE L. DUNCAN
PHILIP L. CHABOT, JR.

Attorneys for Respondents
James J. Angleton
Ray Rocca

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 75-2006

AGNES LAMONT, GLADYS BISSONETTE, ELLEN MOVES CAMP, EUGENE WHITE HAWK, MARVIN GHOST BEAR, EDGAR BEAR RUNNER, OSCAR BEAR RUNNER, SEVERT YOUNG BEAR, RACHEL WHITE DRESS, HELEN RED FEATHER, EDDIE WHITE DRESS, VICKI LITTLE MOON, MADONNA GILBERT, LORELEI MEANS AND CARLA BLAKLEY, APPELLANTS

v.

ALEXANDER HAIG, Lieutenant General United States Army, *et al.*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia

(D.C. Civil Action No. 75-0271)

Argued October 20, 1976

Decided October 16, 1978

David E. Engdahl, with whom *Terrance A. Sidley* was on the brief, for appellants.

Stanley Dalton Wright, Attorney, Department of Justice, with whom *Robert L. Keuch, Edward S. Christenbury* and *Thaddeus B. Hodgdon,* Attorneys, Department of Justice, were on the brief, for appellees.

Before BAZELON, TAMM and ROBINSON, *Circuit Judges.*

Opinion for the Court filed by *Circuit Judge* ROBINSON.

ROBINSON, *Circuit Judge*: Appellants instituted suit to recover damages allegedly flowing from the deployment and utilization of Army and Air Force personnel for law-enforcement purposes pursuant to a conspiracy by appellees, present or past officers or employees of the United States.[1] The episode complained of took place in and around the Village of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, from February until May of 1973. Appellants assert that the events that transpired then and there gave rise to an implied civil cause of action under the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause and 18 U.S.C. § 1385, which penalizes criminally the use of elements of the Army or Air Force to execute the laws, absent express constitutional or statutory authority.[2] The District Court dismissed the action for lack

---

[1] The complaint alleged that all plaintiffs save one were residents or visitors at the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation during the time it was besieged by federal troops. Complaint ¶ 6, Joint Appendix (J. App.) 6-7. Defendants were governmental officials assertedly responsible for the presence of the federal force at the reservation. Complaint ¶¶ 1-5, J. App. 3-5.

[2] "Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a possess comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both." 18 U.S.C. § 1385 (1976).

of venue[3] under 28 U.S.C. § 1391,[4] and expressly declined to rule on other procedural objections advanced by appellees.[5]

We hold that Section 1391(e) conferred venue only

---

[3] *Lamont* v. *Haig*, No. 75-271 (D.D.C. 1975) (unpublished order). See note 5 *infra*.

[4] 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (1970), as amended by Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-574, § 2, 90 Stat. 2721-2722, and Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub L. No. 94-583, § 5, 90 Stat. 2897-2898. The only two provisions at all relevant to this litigation are quoted in text *infra* at notes 9, 53.

[5] The District Court's order provided in full:

> This cause having come before the Court on defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint, and the Court having considered the pleadings, briefs, and affidavits filed herein, and it appearing to the Court that aside from difficult questions of personal and subject matter jurisdiction and the possible failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, venue in this Court under 18 U.S.C. § 1391 is improper, and that the defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint should be granted, it is, therefore, by the Court this 31st day of July, 1975,
>
> ORDERED, that the defendants' motion to dismiss be, and the same hereby is, granted and that the action be, and the same hereby is, dismissed without prejudice.

Lamont v. *Haig, supra note* 3, J. App. 26.

Appellants protest that the District Court erred in dismissing their suit instead of transferring it under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) (1976) (providing for a transfer "to any district or division in which [the action] could have been brought" "if it be in the interest of justice") to the District of South Dakota, the jurisdiction other than the District of Columbia wherein substantial acts giving rise to the litigation occurred. Suit could have been brought in South Dakota when the complaint was filed, but the two-year period set by what appellants deem the applicable South Dakota statute of limitations had expired at the time of dismissal. See S.D. Compiled Laws Ann. § 15-2-15 (1967). Although appellants' point has merit, see *Goldlawr, Inc.* v. *Heiman*, 369 U.S. 463, 466-467, 82 S.Ct. 913, 915-916, 8 L.Ed.2d 39, 42 (1962); *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, —— U.S.App.D.C. ——, —— n.15, 569 F.2d 1, 3 n.15 (1977) *petition for cert. filed*, 46 U.S.L.W. 3694 (U.S. May 28, 1978); *cf. United States ex rel. Angell Bros., Inc.* v. *Cave Constr. Co.*, 250 F.Supp. 873, 874 (D. Mont. 1966), our disposition of this appeal eliminates any present need to consider that issue.

with respect to those appellees who retained positions in the Federal Government at the time appellants' suit was commenced.[6] We find, however, that ambiguity in appellants' complaint precludes determination of whether Section 1391(b) bestows venue over claims against the remaining appellees.[7] Consequently, we remand to permit amendments to the complaint and to enable the District Court to reconsider its ruling in light of the clarification to be afforded thereby.[8]

I. SECTION 1391(e) VENUE

In relevant part Section 1391(e) provides:

> A civil action in which a defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority . . . may, except as otherwise provided by law, be brought in any judicial district in which (1) a defendant in the action resides, or (2) the cause of action arose, or (3) any real property involved in the action is situated, or (4) the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action. Additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and with such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers [or] employees . . . were not a party.
>
> The summons and complaint in such an action shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail

---

[6] Part I *infra*.

[7] Part II *infra*.

[8] Part II *infra*.

beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought.[9]

Very recently, in *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*,[10] we construed this provision as encompassing suits for money damages against federal officers who had acted under color of law though in excess of legal authority. In *Briggs*, the defendants all held federal posts at the time suit was filed, as well as when the cause of action arose.[11] In the case at bar, the constitutional and statutory violations charged were allegedly perpetrated by appellees while they were federal incumbants and were acting as such under color of their official authority.[12] The similarity ends at this point, however, for prior to commencement of appellants' action, several of the 14 appellees withdrew from federal service. Whether that occurrence renders Section 1391(e) inapplicable to them—though there is no venue problem as to the others—is the question we must first address.

---

[9] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) (1976), as amended by Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-574, § 2, 90 Stat. 2721-2722. Appellants point particularly to subsection (1), permitting suit where "a defendant in the action resides" when venue under §1391(e) is otherwise proper. At least one appellee, Wayne Colburn, Director of the United States Marshals Service, officially resided in the District of Columbia at the time suit was filed.

[10] *Supra* note 5.

[11] Defendant William H. Stafford, Jr., was a United States Attorney when the acts giving rise to the litigation occurred and at the time suit was commenced although, after the complaint was filed, he was appointed United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida. See *Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra* note 5, —— U.S.App.D.C. at —— & n.1, 569 F.2d at 2 & n.1; Reply Brief for Appellants at 4 n.*, *Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra* note 4.

[12] Apellants' complaint asserts that appellees "did all of the acts alleged in this complaint purporting to do so, and purporting to have authority to do so, under law and by virtue of the offices that they held." Complaint ¶ 4, J. App. 4.

A. *The Statutory Text*

Our quest begins with a close look at the language of Section 1391(e), and several of its ramifications become quite readily apparent. It has no application unless at least one defendant to the action [13] is either (a) "an officer or employee of the United States or [some] agency thereof," [14] or (b) "an agency of the United States" [15] or (c) "the United States" itself.[16] Moreover, if venue is

---

[13] As originally enacted in 1962, § 1391(e) applied only to "[a] civil action in which *each* defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States. . . ." Act of Oct. 5, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-748, § 2, 76 Stat. 744 (emphasis supplied). Most courts, however, did not give the words "each defendant" a literal reading. *E.g., Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *TVA*, 459 F.2d 255, 257 n.3 (2d Cir. 1972) ("the 'each defendant' requirement applies only to those defendants as to whom plaintiffs seek to justify venue and personal jurisdiction under § 1391(e)"); *Powelton Civic Home Owners Ass'n* v. *HUD*, 284 F.Supp. 809, 832-834 (E.D. Pa. 1968) (requirement that "each defendant" be a federal defendant refers only to defendants beyond the territorial limits of the forum). In 1976, Congress amended § 1391(e) to make plain that it extends to litigation in which "a defendant" is a federal agency, officer or employee though all defendants may not be. Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-574, 90 Stat. 2721. The factor precipitating the change was the susceptibility of the 1962 language to a construction excluding joinder of non-federal defendants. S. Rep. No. 94-996, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 17-18 (1976); H.R. Rep. No. 94-1656, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 18-19 (1976), reprinted in [1976] U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 6139-6140. See note 36 *infra*. Given the expansionistic purpose underlying § 1391(e), see text *infra* at note 35, we must assume at least an equal congressional concern respecting joinder of multiple federal defendants.

[14] See text *supra* at note 9.

[15] See text *supra* at note 9. The term "agency" means "any department, independent establishment, commission, administration, authority, board, or bureau of the United States, or any corporation in which the United States has a proprietary interest." S. Rep. No. 1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 4 (1962), reprinted in [1962] U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 2787.

[16] See text *supra* at note 9.

predicated upon the presence of a federal officer or employee as a defendant, he must, as we have indicated, have "act[ed] in his official capacity or under color of legal authority." [17] If a defendant is a federal officer or employee who has taken such action, or is the United States or one of its agencies, and no other statute requires otherwise,[18] the plaintiff may choose from among as many as three alternative forums where venue is proper. The first is "where a defendant in the action resides." [19] The second is where "the cause of action arose." [20] The third is where "any real property involved

---

[17] See text *supra* at note 9. See also *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, *supra* note 5, —— U.S.App.D.C. at ——, 569 F.2d at 5; *Relf* v. *Gasch*, 167 U.S.App.D.C. 238, 241 n.15, 511 F.2d 804, 807 n.15 (1975); *Paley* v. *Wolk*, 262 F.Supp. 640, 643 (N.D. Ill. 1965), *cert. denied*, 386 U.S. 963, 87 S.Ct. 1031, 18 L.Ed.2d 112 (1967); *Chase Savs. & Loan Ass'n* v. *Federal Home Loan Bank Bd.*, 269 F.Supp. 965, 967 (E.D. Pa. 1967).

[18] See text *supra* at note 9. See also S. Rep. No. 1992, *supra* note 15; *Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *TVA*, *supra* note 13, 459 F.2d at 258-259; *Leber* v. *Canal Zone Cent. Labor Union*, 383 F.2d 110, 113 n.3 (5th Cir. 1967), *cert. denied*, 389 U.S. 1046, 88 S.Ct. 769, 19 L.Ed.2d 838 (1968); *Paley* v. *Wolk*, *supra* note 18, 262 F.Supp. at 642.

[19] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1) (1970), quoted in text *supra* at note 9. What controls is the official residence of the federal defendant—where the official duties are performed—and not the personal residence of an individual who is a defendant. *Tatum* v. *Laird*, 144 U.S.App.D.C. 72, 75, 444 F.2d 947, 950 (1971); *Nestor v. Hershey*, 138 U.S.App.D.C. 73, 90, 425 F.2d 504, 521 (1969); *Stroud* v. *Benson*, 254 F.2d 448, 451 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 817, 79 S.Ct. 28, 3 L.Ed.2d 59 (1958); *Miske* v. *United States*, 77 F.R.D. 425, 429 (D.D.C. 1978); see also 1 J. Moore, Federal Practice ¶ 0.142 [5-1-2], at 1396 (2d ed. 1948).

[20] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(2) (1976), quoted in text *supra* at note 9. See generally 15 C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice § 3806 (1976).

in the action is situated" [21] or, if none is involved, where "the plaintiff resides." [22]

Section 1391(e) thus addresses the issue of venue proper as to the United States, a federal agency, or a federal officer or employee whose conduct meets the statutory specifications. The section makes clear, moreover, that "additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action" [23]—an action against a federal defendant just described—but its instruction regarding venue with respect to "[a]dditional persons" is quite different. For them it is necessary to satisfy "such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers, employees, or agencies were not a party." [24] So, while Section 1391(e) has provided specially for and, indeed, has broadened [25] venue vis-a-vis the federal defendants it designates, the conditions conferring venue as to an "[a]dditional person[]" must also exist before that

---

[21] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(3) (1976), quoted in text *supra* at note 9. See *McKenna* v. *Udall*, 135 U.S.App.D.C. 335, 340, 418 F.2d 1171, 1176 (1969); *Pruess* v. *Udall*, 123 U.S.App. D.C. 301, 303, 359 F.2d 615, 617 (1965); *Dredge Corp.* v. *Penny*, 338 F.2d 456, 464 (9th Cir. 1964).

[22] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(4) (1976), quoted in text *supra* at note 9. See *McEachern* v. *United States*, 321 F.2d 31, 33 (4th Cir. 1963); *Ellingburg* v. *Connett*, 457 F.2d 240, 241-242 (5th Cir. 1972); *Delaware* v. *Bender*, 370 F.Supp. 1193, 1199-1200 (D. Del. 1974). As to multiple plaintiffs, compare, *e.g.*, *Smith* v. *Lyon*, 133 U.S. 315, 317, 10 S.Ct. 303, 304, 33 L.Ed. 635, 636 (1889), and *Manchester Modes, Inc.* v. *Schuman*, 426 F.2d 629, 633 n.7 (2d Cir. 1970), with *Environmental Defense Fund* v. *Corps of Eng'rs*, 325 F.Supp. 728, 732 (D. Ark. 1971), and *Candarini* v. *Attorney Gen.*, 369 F.Supp. 1132, 1135 (E.D. N.Y. 1974).

[23] See text *supra* at note 9.

[24] See text *supra* at note 9; note 36 *infra*.

[25] *Schlanger* v. *Seamans*, 401 U.S. 487, 490 n.4, 91 S.Ct. 995, 997 n.4, 28 L.Ed2d 251, 254 n.4 (1971); *Liberation News Serv.* v. *Eastland*, 426 F.2d 1379, 1383-1384 (2d Cir. 1970).

person may be joined in the litigation.[26] It follows that if suit is sought to be maintained not only against a federal defendant embraced within Section 1391(e) but also against an "[a]dditional person[]," there must be proper venue—as specified in the pertinent statutes—as to each.[27]

Aside from venue, there may of course be other problems for the plaintiff in a suit against several defendants, some of whom are federal officers. Joinder of "[a]dditional persons" must conform to standard practice,[28] and it goes without saying that personal jurisdiction over each defendant is indispensable to in personam actions. Save in one respect, Section 1391(e) itself governs neither of these matters; on the contrary, it makes clear that joinder of parties and service of process must observe relevant demands of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.[29] The sole exception is that in cases wherein it applies, "the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought." [30]

Section 1391(e), fully analyzed, emerges as a provision according federal agencies and servants special treatment for venue purposes—treatment unlike that extended

---

[26] "Section 1391(e) controls venue against the federal defendants, and other defendants may be joined if the venue is one that would be proper to them without regard to section 1391(e)." 15 C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice § 3815 (Supp. 1978).

[27] *Blum* v. *Morgan Guar. Trust Co.*, 539 F.2d 1388, 1391 (5th Cir. 1976).

[28] *Nestor* v. *Hershey, supra* note 19, 138 U.S.App.D.C. at 91, 425 F.2d at 572.

[29] See text *supra* at note 9.

[30] See text *supra* at note 9. See also note 27 *supra* and accompanying text. As to the process-service aspects of § 1391(e), see 4 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice § 1107 (1969).

to any other litigant. And the statutory language indicates that its unique venue specifications regarding individual defendants are limited to those enjoying federal office or employment when initially sued. One searches Section 1391(e) in vain for even so much as a hint of any congressional desire to widen venue or ameliorate service of process in suits against those whose federal incumbency is a thing of the past. As "we are not at liberty to act in [Congress'] stead," [31] we must construe Section 1391(e) as its terms apparently demand absent evidence of a contrary legislative intent or a showing that adherence to a natural reading of the statutory language will produce a result at variance with the policy of the legislation as a whole.[32]

B. *The Legislative History*

Less than striking is the discovery that nothing in the legislative history of Section 1391(e) specifically indicates that its provisions were meant to apply to suits filed against former federal personnel. In the committee reports and during debate in both Houses, reference was commonly made to federal officers and employees, but in no instance was coverage of past jobholders explicitly addressed. It is surprising that if Section 1391(e) was actually intended to reach bygone federal servants, some congressional articulation of that purpose did not eventuate. For "[t]he construction urged by [appellants] would potentially subject a retired government official to

---

[31] *Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra* note 5, —— U.S.App.D.C. at ——, 569 F.2d at 10.

[32] See, *e.g., Driver* v. *Helms*, 577 F.2d 147, 150 (1st Cir. 1978); *Massachusetts Financial Servs., Inc.* v. *Securities Protector Investor Corp.*, 545 F.2d 754, 756 (1st Cir. 1976), *cert. denied*, 431 U.S. 904, 97 S.Ct. 1696, 52 L.Ed.2d 388 (1977).

suit in any federal court in the country," [33] and it seems "inconceivable that Congress would so substantially broaden the venue provision applicable to every individual once employed by the federal government without comment." [34]

To be sure, Congress did outline the legislation's broad objectives, and principal among the congressional aims was provision of a "readily available, inexpensive judicial remed[y] for the citizen who is aggrieved by the workings of Government." [35] By expanding venue and easing the rigors of process-service requirements in suits against federal officials, Congress certainly advanced that goal considerably. It does not necessarily follow, however, that Congress meant to go further and "provide a net that could draw everyone connected with a governmental action into litigation in a particular district. . . ." [36] We are

---

[33] *Kipperman* v. *McCone,* 422 F.Supp. 860, 877 (N.D. Cal. 1976). This is so because § 1391(e) permits venue in, and service of process from, "any judicial district in which . . . the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action." See text *supra* at note 9.

[34] *Kipperman* v. *McCone, supra* note 33, 422 F.Supp. at 877; *cf. Laborer's Int'l Union* v. *NLRB,* —— U.S.App.D.C. ——, ——, 567 F.2d 1006, 1013 (1977) (congressional silence on important aspect of statutory coverage militates against inference of intention to alter status quo).

[35] H.R. Rep. No. 1936, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. 3 (1960).

[36] *Driver* v. *Helms, supra* note 32, 577 F.2d at 150. The legislative history of the 1976 amendment to § 1391(e) provides additional evidence that advancement of a plaintiff's interest in conveniently prosecuting claims based on official misconduct must be tempered to avoid hardship to defendants not employed by the United States. Prior to the amendment, as we have observed, § 1391(e) applied only when "each defendant" was a federal officer or employee. See note 13 *supra.* Because adherence to that requirement would exempt actions involving nonfederal defendants otherwise subject to venue and personal jurisdiction in the forum district, compare *Town of East Haven* v. *Eastern Airlines,* 282 F.Supp. 507 (D. Conn. 1968), with *Green* v. *Laird,* 357 F.Supp. 227 (N.D. Ill. 1973), Congress amended the section to enable its application when "a defendant"

mindful that legal representation at governmental expense is frequently, though discretionarily, extended to those who were in federal employ in the past.[37] But,

---

is a federal officer or employee. See note 13 *supra*. The Department of Justice objected to the bill as introduced because it " 'would permit any plaintiff to obtain venue against any private defendant by simply joining as a party to the action a Federal official over whom venue may be obtained under 28 U.S.C. section 1391(e).' " S. Rep. No. 996, *supra* note 13, 18, quoting Letter from Antonin Scalia, Assistant Attorney General, to Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman, Subcommittee on Ad. Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate (May 10, 1976); H.R. Rep. No. 1656, *supra* note 13, at 18 (same). So, "[t]o avoid any hardship or unfair disadvantage to private defendants that might result from subjecting them to plaintiff's broadened choice of venue under section 1391(e) as amended," S. Rep. No. 996, *supra* note 13, at 18, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary amended the pertinent sentence of the bill to read as follows:

> Additional persons may be joined as parties to any such action in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure *and with such other venue requirements as would be applicable if the United States or one of its officers, employees or agencies were not a party.*

Id. (emphasis supplied by the Committee). The Committee recognized that "[i]n effect, this will mean that a private defendant can only be sued in a venue where he could have been sued if the Government had not been a party. As a practical matter, it will usually mean that the plaintiff will have to bring suit in the district where the defendant resides rather than in his own district." *Id.* Thus, under § 1391(e) as amended, a plaintiff distressed by official misconduct who sues both a federal and a nonfederal defendant who participated in the activity undergirding the lawsuit must press his claim in a district having venue with respect to the nonfederal defendant by authority other than § 1391(e), notwithstanding the procedural burden on vindication of the plaintiff's grievance.

[37] See 28 C.F.R. pt. 50 (1977). When it is "in the interest of the United States," the Department of Justice will undertake the representation—or pay for representation by a private attorney when a conflict of interest might otherwise ensue—of former federal servants sued in an individual capacity for acts reasonably appearing to have been performed within the scope of the former employment. *Id.* See also 28 U.S.C. § 516 (1970). Defense of past personnel may well be less commonly compelled by governmental interest than defense of those currently employed simply because an adverse judgment might impact less on continuing govermental operations in the former context than in the latter.

counsel fees aside, defense of a damage action is hardly a desired experience, and its situs in a distant forum may well entail an appreciable disruption of the defendant's ongoing affairs.[38] A congressional determination to treat burdens of that magnitude as incidents of current federal service is not readily transferable to actions against those who have shed the mantel of federal office.[39]

C. *The Sum of Relevant Considerations*

Confronted, then, with a relatively unambiguous statute, an absence of any specific indication of congressional intent to deny erstwhile federal officials the venue protection traditionally afforded defendants, and a general statutory design largely unadaptable to the context of the present controversy, our course seems relatively clear. However the inclusion of former federal officeholders within the purview of Section 1391(e) may fare on the scale of wisdom, the judgment was one for Congress to make, and we are constrained to acknowledge their exemption.

---

[38] In *Driver* v. *Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382 (D.R.I. 1977), *rev'd*, 557 F.2d 147 (1st Cir. 1978), the District Court had determined that "the greatest portion of effort required in defending *this* lawsuit will not require defendants to travel or undertake other actions interfering with their ongoing activities." *Id.* at 400 (emphasis supplied). That extension of § 1391(e) to reach defendants in one particular action would not result in significant impositions does not justify categorical inclusion of former federal jobholders in the class of defendants affected by that section.

[39] We need not ponder whether the same considerations of repose militate against § 1391(e) coverage of a defendant who, though in federal employ at the time suit is filed, holds a position distinctly different from that occupied at the time the acts or omissions complained of transpired. It may be that § 1391(e) is most naturally read as covering suits against a federal officeholder for activity in the selfsame office. See *Driver* v. *Helms*, *supra* note 32, 577 F.2d at 151 n.11. We intimate no view in this regard, however, for the record is unclear as to whether the issue is directly involved in this case. The District Court will, of course, undertake appropriate inquiries on this score on remand.

Our conclusion draws strong support from the well considered decision of the only other federal appellate court to address the issue thus far. Recently, in *Driver* v. *Helms*,[40] the First Circuit endorsed our determination in *Briggs*[41] that Section 1391(e) embraces actions for money damages but ruled that it does not extend to suits against those no longer in federal employment. Moreover, our holding today was foreshadowed, if not compelled, by one of our earlier pronouncements on the subject. We had occasion to construe Section 1391(e) in *Relf* v. *Gasch*,[42] which involved a transfer of civil litigation purportedly under authority of 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) to a district "where it might have been brought."[43] The *Relf* plaintiffs pressed a claim for damages against present and past federal officials not only for misuse of authority but also for purely personal conduct.[44] Insofar as the plaintiffs sought relief for activities of the latter sort, we doubted that Section 1391(e) authorized venue in or service of process from the transferee court.[45] Even "apart from the inefficacy of process available in [the transferee] district for any defendant sued only in a purely personal role,"[46] we pointed out that the de-

---

[40] *Supra* note 32.

[41] *Supra* note 5.

[42] *Supra* note 17.

[43] 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (1976).

[44] All defendants had been federal servants; some had left governmental employment prior to commencement of suit. *Relf* v. *Gasch*, *supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 242 n.19, 511 F.2d at 808 n.19.

[45] As a prerequisite to transfer under § 1404(a) venue must be proper in the transferee district with respect to every defendant and each claim for relief, *id.* at 241, 511 F.2d at 807, and all defendants must have been amenable to process emanating from the transferee district at the time the action was initially filed, *id.* at 241 n.12, 511 F.2d at 807 n.12.

[46] See *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, *supra* note 5, —— U.S.App.D.C. at ——, 569 F.2d at 6-7 (explaining *Relf*).

parture of some of the defendants from federal service prior to institution of suit "increas[e] the likelihood that they were not amenable to service of process from" the transferee court.[47] Personal jurisdiction over the defendants in *Relf* could have rested only on Section 1391 (e) or on the defendants' presence in the transferee district, and on the record the latter seemed improbable. We remanded the case to enable amendments to the complaint for the purpose of developing a more complete basis for determining whether venue was proper and personal jurisdiction existed in the transferee district.[48]

We now reaffirm *Relf* and explicitly hold that former federal officers and employees are beyond the reach of Section 1391(e).[49] That does not mean that the section

---

[47] *Relf* v. *Gasch, supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 242, 511 F.2d at 808.

[48] The concurring judge in *Relf* agreed with the majority that the separation from federal service of some of the defendants prior to the filing of the complaint made § 1391(e) inapplicable to them. *Id.* Because the prospect of properly serving those defendants depended upon their unlikely presence in the transferee district at the time of the activities in issue, the concurring opinion concluded that the "action against [them] probably could not be transferred." *Relf* v. *Gasch, supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 242, 511 F.2d at 808. See also *Briggs* v. *Goodwin, supra* note 4, —— U.S.App.D.C. at —— n.52, 569 F.2d at 7 n.52.

[49] Accord, *Driver* v. *Helms, supra* note 32, 577 F.2d at 149- 151; *Kipperman* v. *McCone, supra* note 33, 422 F.Supp. at 876-877; *Wu* v. *Keeney,* 384 F.Supp. 1161, 1168 (D.D.C. 1974). Contra, *United States* v. *McAninch,* 435 F.Supp. 240, 245 (E.D. N.Y. 1977); *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney,* 401 F.Supp. 952, 962 (E.D. N.Y. 1975).

Appellants' reliance on decisions construing the "doing business" requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) (1970), *e.g., Farmers Elevator Mut. Ins. Co.* v. *Carl J. Austad & Sons, Inc.,* 343 F.2d 7, 12 (8th Cir. 1965), and § 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 22 (1976), which refers to the place where a defendant "transacts business," *e.g., Eastland Constr. Co.* v. *Keasbey & Mattison Co.,* 358 F.2d 777, 780 (9th Cir. 1965), to denote the time when the cause of action arose—notwithstanding statutory use of the present tense—is misplaced. The language of § 1391(e) and its legislative history

is completely inapplicable to the case at bar, for one or more appellees remained in federal employ at the time appellants' suit was filed.[50] Section 1391(e) furnished venue for the action against those appellees and, as we have said, it specifically authorizes joinder of additional persons as parties if venue requirements otherwise applicable are met.[51] The only possible alternative basis for venue, however, is Section 1391(b), a general provision pertaining to civil litigation not resting jurisdictionally on diverse citizenship. Since the District Court ruled broadly here that venue did not lie in the District of Columbia under Section 1391,[52] we must review the determination, implicit in its dismissal of appellants' lawsuit, with respect to Section 1391(b).

II. VENUE UNDER SECTION 1391(b)

In Section 1391(b) Congress ordained:

> A civil action wherein jurisdiction is not founded solely on diversity of citizenship may be brought only

---

reflect focused congressional attention on a discrete class of defendants to which former federal jobholders do not belong. Their inclusion in the category of defendants amenable to the expanded venue and lax service requirements of § 1391(e) subjects them to suit anywhere in the United States that a potential plaintiff might reside and accordingly threatens hardships Congress may never have intended to impose.

By contrast, liberal interpretation of § 1391(c) and the Clayton Act accords with their legislative history, see Comment, *Time of Venue Under Section 12 of the Clayton Act Refers to Time When Action Accrued,* 65 Mich. L. Rev. 995 (1967); *cf.* Comment, *Venue: Then or Now? Section 22 of the Sherman Act,* 115 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1007 (1967), and results in recognition of venue in only a limited number of jurisdictions—just those in which the corporate defendant actually transacted business at the time the cause of action arose. And hardship resulting from geographical distance, while of concern in the context of natural defendants, is considerably less significant when corporate defendants are involved. See 1 J. Moore, *supra* note 19, ¶ 0.140[1.-1] at 1308-1309.

[50] See note 11 *supra* and accompanying text.

[51] See text *supra* at notes 24, 26.

[52] See notes 4-5 *supra.*

> in the judicial district where all defendants reside, or in which the claim arose, except as otherwise provided by law.[53]

As some of those made defendants to this litigation did not reside in the District of Columbia, venue under Section 1391(b) is proper only if it is a district "in which the claim arose." At first blush that might appear to be a determination easy enough to make but, though simply phrased, this component of Section 1391(b) has sometimes proved puzzling in application for two principal reasons. In the first place, Congress did not supply any particular definition of the language "in which the claim arose," either in statutory text or in pertinent legislative history, and no black-letter rule is derivable from other legal contexts in which that phraseology is employed.[54] Perhaps more seriously, the reference to "*the* judicial district" in which the claim arose might suggest that only a single district can satisfy the statutory standard with respect to any given claim. Though resort to familiar common law theories might furnish a reasonable ground for selection of a particular district in uncomplicated tort or contract actions,[55] choice of a single district is a much more difficult undertaking when sophisticated multistate activities of relative complexity are in issue.[56]

---

[53] 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (1976).

[54] Professor Moore has examined extensively the use of the phrase "where the claim arose" and has discerned no general agreement on its meaning in any context. He has cautioned that construction of the phrase for nonvenue purposes may not have any relevance to the venue question of "convenience of trial location." See 1 J. Moore, *supra* note 19, ¶ 0.142[5.-2] at 1427-1428.

[55] Compare Restatement, Conflict of Laws, § 377 (1934) (law of the place of the wrong—the state wherein the last event necessary to make an actor liable for the alleged tort occurs—governs tort action); Restatement, Contracts § 74 (1932) (contract action arises where last act necessary for formation of contract occurs).

[56] See, *e.g.*, *Tefal, S.A.* v. *Products Int'l Co.*, 529 F.2d 495 (3d Cir. 1976); *Commercial Lighting Prods., Inc.* v. *United States Dist.*

The legislative history of Section 1391(b), by its very generality, is helpful in the resolution of the problem. The portion of Section 1391(b) extending venue to a district "in which the claim arose" was added by amendment in 1966,[57] and the resulting "enlargement of venue" was intended merely to "facilitate the disposition of . . . claims by providing, in appropriate cases, a more convenient forum to the litigants and the witnesses involved." [58] The legislative concern was pragmatic: Since

---

Ct., 537 F.2d 1078 (9th Cir. 1976); *Ghazoul* v. *International Management Servs., Inc.*, 398 F.Supp. 307 (S.D. N.Y. 1975); *Scott Paper Co.* v. *Scott's Liquid Gold, Inc.*, 374 F.Supp. 184 (D. Del. 1974); *California Clippers, Inc.* v. *United States Soccer Football Ass'n*, 314 F.Supp. 1057 (N.D. Cal. 1970); *Philadelphia Housing Auth.* v. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.*, 291 F.Supp. 252 (E.D. Pa. 1968); *Carter-Wallace, Inc.* v. *Ever-Dry Corp.*, 290 F.Supp. 735, 739 (S.D. N.Y. 1968); Comment, *Federal Venue: Locating the Place Where the Claim Arose*, 54 Tex. L. Rev. 392 (1976) (*passim*).

[57] Act of Nov. 2, 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-714, § 1, 80 Stat. 1111.

[58] H.R. Rep. No. 1893, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1966); accord, S. Rep. No. 1752, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 1-2 (1966).

Section 1391(a) was amended simultaneously, and to the same end. See Act of Nov. 2, 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-714, § 1, 80 Stat. 1111. The addition of the phrase "in which the claim arose" supplanted the earlier § 1391(f), which had provided:

> A civil action on a tort claim arising out of the manufacture, assembly, repair, ownership, maintenance, use, or operation of an automobile may be brought in the judicial district wherein the act or omission complained of occurred.

Act of Dec. 23, 1963, Pub. L. No. 88-234, 77 Stat. 473. See also Act of Nov. 2, 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-714, § 2, 80 Stat. 1111 (repealing subsection (f)).

Section 1391(f), as ultimately enacted, prevailed over an initial proposal that would have provided that "a civil action on a tort claim may be brought in the judicial district wherein the act or omission complained of occurred." H.R. Rep. No. 385, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 1 (1963). With respect to the original bill, the House Committee on the Judiciary explained that the "extension of the venue provisions of Title 28 . . . will improve judicial administration" because, among other reasons, "often the records and the witnesses

the place where the claim arose is the situs of events important to the case, Congress undertook "to facilitate the administration of justice" [59] by permitting suit in a district where the litigation might more handily progress.[60]

This practical orientation of Section 1391(b), then, counsels against adherence to mechanical standards in its application.[61] Rather, where "the claim arose" should in our view be ascertained by advertence to events having operative significance in the case, and a commonsense appraisal of the implications of those events for accessibility to witnesses and records.[62] And, though a prolifera-

---

which and who are to produce the evidence in the court, will be from the local area wherein the tort occurred[;] [t]hus, greater convenience will be afforded as to the witnesses and it would also lesson costs to the litigants." *Id.* at 2; See S. Rep. No. 620, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 1 (1963). Though passed by both Houses, see 109 Cong. Rec. 12154, 20601 (1963), the Senate requested that the bill be returned for further study, see 109 Cong. Rec. 20829 (1963) (remarks of Sen. Russell, expressing concern that the bill might have further implications in tort actions than "settl[ing] the jurisdiction where the witnesses [are] readily available"). It was subsequently amended and passed as Pub. L. No. 88-234, *supra.*

[59] Letter from Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, to Emanuel Celler, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives (Nov. 5, 1965), attached to and made part of S. Rep. No. 1752, *supra* note 58, at 3.

[60] See text at note 58 *supra.*

[61] See, *e.g.*, cases cited *supra* note 56.

[62] In some cases, testimony of nonparties and records or other evidence not in the parties' possession may be insignificant; in others, it may be most readily available in areas in which none of the principal events in issue in the suit occurred. In such situations, the forum court should not oppose the plaintiff's choice of venue if the activities that transpired in the forum district were not insubstantial in relation to the totality of events giving rise to the plaintiff's grievance and if the forum is generally convenient for all litigants. An additional, important consideration might be ensuring the existence of at least one forum wherein venue and personal jurisdiction requirements permit multiple-party litigation to proceed. See *Bru-*

tion of permissible forums is staunchly to be avoided,[63] it is evident that the often unfruitful pursuit of a single locality as the one and only district in which the claim arose is not needed to ensure the efficient conduct of the litigation. Not surprisingly, then, courts in some number have construed Section 1391(b) as conferring venue in a district where a substantial portion of the acts or omissions giving rise to the actions occurred, notwithstanding that venue might also lie in other districts.[64] We endorse that interpretation wholeheartedly. So long as the

---

nette Mach. Works, Ltd. v. *Kockum Indus., Inc.*, 406 U.S. 706, 710 n.8, 92 S.Ct. 1936, 1939 n.8, 32 L.Ed.2d 428, 431 n.8 (1972); *Transamerica Corp.* v. *Transfer Planning, Inc.*, 419 F.Supp. 1261, 1263 (S.D. N.Y. 1976); *Iranian Shipping Lines, S.A.* v. *Moraites*, 377 F.Supp. 644, 647 (S.D. N.Y. 1974).

[63] See *Philadelphia Housing Auth.* v. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., supra* note 56:

> Here Congress was still interested in seeing to it that plaintiffs do not have virtually unlimited power to bring actions in any forum—to "give plaintiffs free rein to haul defendants hither and yon at their caprice."

291 F.Supp. at 260, quoting *United States* v. *National City Lines, Inc.*, 334 U.S. 573, 588, 68 S.Ct. 1169, 1177, 92 L.Ed. 1584, 1593 (1947). See also *Transamerica Corp.* v. *Transfer Planning, Inc., supra* note 62, 419 F.Supp. at 1263; *Honda Assocs., Inc.*, v. *Nozawa Trading, Inc.*, 374 F.Supp. 886, 889 (S.D. N.Y. 1974).

[64] *E.g., Tefal, S.A.* v. *Products Int'l Co., supra* note 56, 529 F.2d at 496-497; *Gardner Eng'r Corp.* v. *Page Eng'r Co.*, 484 F.2d 27, 33 (8th Cir. 1973); *Commercial Lighting Prods., Inc.* v. *United States Dist. Ct., supra* note 56, 537 F.2d at 1080; see, *e.g., Scott Paper Co.* v. *Scott's Liquid Gold, Inc., supra* note 56, 374 F.Supp. at 190; *United States* v. *Rundle*, 371 F.Supp. 252, 254 (E.D. Pa. 1974); *Carter-Wallace, Inc.* v. *Ever-Dry Corp., supra* note 56, 290 F.Supp. at 739. The "substantial part" construction has been urged by the American Law Institute as well. ALI Study of the Division of Jurisdiction Between the State and Federal Courts §§ 1303, 1314 (1969). See also Comment, *supra* note 56.

A number of courts have adopted a weight-of-the-contacts test, first announced in *Philadelphia Housing Auth.* v. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., supra* note 56. See, *e.g., ABC Great States, Inc.* v. *Globe Ticket Co.*, 310 F.Supp. 739 (N.D. Ill.

substantiality of the operative events is determined by assessment of their ramifications for efficient conduct of the suit [65]—an important step upon which we would unfailingly insist—loyalty to the objectives of Section 1391 (b) will be amptly preserved.[66] We come, then, to the

---

1970); *Ghazoul* v. *International Management Servs., Inc., supra* note 56. Though, in principle, that test may permit selection of a single forum "in which the claim arose," the factors sometimes deemed determinative might well indicate the suitability of several such forums in other cases involving similar causes of action. See, *e.g., Philadelphi Housing Auth.* v. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., supra* note 56 (in antitrust action, venue would lie in any district in which injury occurred if some overt act pursuant to conspiratorial meetings took place in the district and it was a substantial element of the offense; conversely, if a meaningless and insignificant meeting of the conspirators took place in a district, venue would not exist there). Generally, the cases purporting to apply this standard have not illuminated how the contacts are to be weighed or when they are significant. See 15 C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice § 3806, at 36 (1976); *cf. Iranian Shipping Lines* v. *Moraites, supra* note 62, 377 F.Supp. at 647 (rejecting version of test contemplating evaluation of specific calculus of contacts).

[65] See note 62 *supra* and accompanying text.

[66] We think this construction is consistent with the text and intent of § 1391(b). See 1. J. Moore, *supra* note 19:

> [T]he language of both subsections (a) and (b) refer to "*the* district . . . in which *the* claim arose," lending some inference that the draftsmen assumed that every claim arises in some *one* district. Given the looseness with which "the" is sometimes used in statutes, however, this inference, while perhaps persuasive, is not compelling. As to the first "the," there is no reason to suppose that the draftsmen of the 1966 amendment gave it any thought, since they appear to have simply spliced in the phrase "or where the claim arose" in the fashion that would obviate the need to rewrite the subsection. Indeed there appears to be some question as to whether "the" was appropriate in subsection (a) as originally enacted, since "the judicial district where all plaintiffs or all defendants reside" does not refer to a single district, but to one, two, or none, as the case may be.

¶ 0.142[5.-2], at 1431 (emphasis in original) (footnote omitted).

The "substantial part" standard was expressly incorporated into the present § 1391(f), added by amendment in 1976, which con-

question whether the case at bar can pass muster on that basis.

Appellants seek damages for depredations assertedly inflicted in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1385 [67] and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. They aver an appropriation of military equipment and a deployment of military personnel for the purpose of executing the laws in and around the Village of Wounded Knee.[68] Consonantly with the principles we have delineated, Section

---

cerns venue over actions against foreign states. Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-583, § 5, 90 Stat. 2897, providing:

> A civil action against a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title may be brought—
>
> > (1) in any judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred. . . .

The House Committee on the Judiciary explained:

> This provision is analogous to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), which allows an action against the United States to be brought, *inter alia*, in any judicial district in which "the cause of action arose." The test adopted, however, is the newer test recommended by the American Law Institute . . . which does not imply that there is only one such district applicable in each case.

H.R. Rep. No. 1487, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 31-32 (1976); accord, S. Rep. No. 1310, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 31 (1976).

The fact that amendments to § 1391(e) were pending in the same session before Congress but were not supplemented to include the "substantial part" language arguably indicates an intention to preserve a distinction between the standard of § 1391(f) and that of §§ 1391(a), (b), and (e). But the 1976 amendment to § 1391(e) was addressed to a very specific congressional concern, see note 36 *supra*, and the amendment adding the present § 1391(f) was part of similarly specific legislation concerning the multi-district nature of suits against foreign sovereigns. See Act of Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-583, 90 Stat. 2897. To boot, Congress was fashioning a completely new venue provision in § 1391(f) and in that posture opted for the ALI suggestion, so it is not surprising that the opportunity was not taken to amend the venue laws generally.

[67] Quoted *supra* note 2.

[68] See note 1 *supra* and accompanying text.

1391(b) venue of appellants' claims would lie in the District of Columbia if appellees' liability expectably could be established in substantial part by proof of acts or omissions occurring here. Success in that endeavor would depend, however, upon appellants' ability to demonstrate proper venue with respect to each cause of action [69] and each appellee.[70]

Appellants' complaint makes evident that in some appreciable measure defendants' allegedly unlawful activities happened in South Dakota. Indeed, Wounded Knee will long be remembered for the notorious conflagration occurring there. But appellants tell us that events having a major role in the putatively illegal operations took place in the District of Columbia. In their brief, they state that "Washington was 'command central' for the Wounded Knee seige [*sic*]";[71] they insist that "[i]t was there that the conspiracy for execution of that scheme was developed[;] [i]t was from Washington that the critical orders, authorizations, and instructions issued

---

[69] *Relf* v. *Gasch*, *supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 241 n.12, 511 F.2d at 807 n.12; *Jones* v. *Bales*, 58 F.R.D. 453, 458 (N.D. Ga. 1972), *aff'd*, 480 F.2d 805 (5th Cir. 1973); 1 J. Moore, *supra* note 19, ¶ 0.142[4], at 1388. This requirement might be relaxed when parties and proofs for all causes of action are identical. See *Relf* v. *Gasch*, *supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 241 n.12, 511 F.2d at 807 n.12, citing *Laffey* v. *Northwest Airlines, Inc.*, 321 F.Supp. 1041 (D.D.C. 1971), aff'd in part, vacated and remanded in part, 185 U.S.App.D.C. 322, 567 F.2d 429 (1976), *cert. denied*, —— U.S. ——, 98 S.Ct. 1281, 55 L.Ed.2d 792 (1978). See also 1 J. Moore, *supra* note 19, ¶ 0.140[5], at 1329.

[70] See *ABC Great States, Inc.* v. *Globe Ticket Co.*, *supra* note 64, 310 F.Supp. at 743 (venue must be proper as to each defendant and will not be extended to defendants who could not be sued in forum district absent venue over co-conspirators); *Philadelphia Housing Auth.* v. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.*, *supra* note 56, 281 F.Supp. at 261-262 (same); 1 J. Moore, *supra* note 19, ¶ 0.140[1.-2], at 1311 ("venue is a privilege personal to each defendant").

[71] Brief of Appellants at 13.

throughout the seige [*sic*], and it was to Washington that the principal on-site officials periodically returned for consultation and strategy sessions with the officials who held in their Washington offices the ultimate operational control." [72]

Since appellants do not contend that the asserted conspiracy itself is civilly actionable,[73] the mere fact that the conspiracy was formulated in the District of Columbia may bear little significance for potential liability of any appellee whose own contribution to its consummation was confined wholly to South Dakota. At the moment, however, there is no call for a decision on Section 1391(b) venue with respect to any particular appellee. To begin with, the record on appeal, as we shall shortly see, lacks the information vital to individual determinations. Moreover, appellees who assertedly exercised "operational control" from the District of Columbia may be legally accountable even absent willful participation by others in South Dakota. Consequently, appellants might be able to establish liability on the part of "operational controllers" by proof that in substantial part their activities occurred within the District of Columbia.[74] That could be true even as to appellees whose connection with the Wounded Knee affair was limited to planning in the District of Columbia.

The problem, however, is that appellants' complaint

---

[72] *Id.*

[73] Reply Brief of Appellants at 16. Civil conspiracies ordinarily are not independently actionable. See *Jones* v. *Bales, supra* note 69. Nevertheless, the liability of a particular defendant might be proven by evidence of his participation in a civil conspiracy that was actually executed by co-conspirators. Witnesses and records necessary to establish that defendant's liability might be available in the district of his participation rather than the district wherein the scheme was effectuated.

[74] See text *supra* at notes 61-66.

does not explicate the claims indicated more comprehensively in their brief before this court. Although conferences and other conduct related to the conspiracy were chronicled in the complaint, with rare exception the locus of those activities does not appear. We thus are unable to appraise the tenor and extent—or the implications for facility of this litigation—of events that may have taken place in the District of Columbia, and the same disability may well have precluded a considered judgment by the District Court. In these circumstances, we think appellants should have the opportunity to amend the complaint to specify more clearly which of the asserted activities transpired here and which appellees are thought to have had a hand therein.[75] Then, in light of the amendments and our construction of Section 1391(b), the District Court can more soundly determine whether and to what extent venue may be proper under that section.[76]

The judgment dismissing appellants' suit for want of proper venue is accordingly vacated, and the case is remanded to the District Court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

So ordered.

---

[75] *Cf. Relf* v. *Gasch, supra* note 17, 167 U.S.App.D.C. at 241-242, 511 F.2d at 807-808.

[76] We necessarily leave to the District Court on remand the determination whether the contacts with the District of Columbia alleged in the complaint, as it might be amended, betoken the convenience of litigating here. If it appears that appellants' proof may in fact only minimally concern activities that occurred here, then convenience might be promoted by litigating this case in South Dakota. If that emerges as the proper conclusion, then transfer pursuant to § 1406(a) might be considered. See note 5 *supra*.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
SEP 22 1978
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

vs.

RICHARD HELMS, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS BUNDY, CARTER, DAY & WATSON IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

DONALD J. COHN
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10020
Attorney for Respondents,
McGeorge Bundy, Marshall S. Carter,
J. Edward Day, W. Marvin Watson

Of Counsel:

JAMES V. KEARNEY
WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD

ALAN T. DWORKIN
AISENBERG & DWORKIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Authorities Cited i

Question Presented 1

Statement of the Case 2

ARGUMENT 3

1. No Important Questions of Law 4

2. No Conflict Among the Circuits 6

CONCLUSION 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Avery v. *United States*, 434 F. Supp. 937 (D. Conn. 1977) 5n

Birnbaum v. *United States*, 436 F. Supp. 967 (Ed., N.Y. 1977), appeal pending (2d Cir.) 5n

Bivens v. *Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) 5

Briggs v. *Goodwin*, 569 F. 2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), *petition for cert. pending sub. nom Stafford* v. *Briggs* (No. 77-1545) 6

Driver v. *Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382 (D.R.I. 1977), aff'd in part, 577 F. 2d 147 (1st Cir. 1978) 2, 3

Driver v. *United States*, 77-C-919 (E.D.N.Y., Feb. 17, 1978) 5n

Kipperman v. *McCone*, 422 F. Supp. 860 (N.D. Cal. 1976) 3, 5, 5n

PAGE

Liberation News Service v. *Eastland*, 426 F. 2d 1379 (2d Cir. 1970) 6n

Lowenstein v. *Rooney*, 401 F. Supp. 952 (E.D.N.Y. 1975) 5, 5n-6n

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 459 F. 2d 255 (2d Cir. 1972) 6n

United States v. *McAninch*, 435 F. Supp. 240 (E.D.N.Y. 1977) 5, 6n

Wilson v. *United States*, 77-C-975 (E.D.N.Y., Feb. 17, 1978) 5n

Wu v. *Keeney*, 384 F. Supp. 1161 (D.D.C. 1974) 3, 5, 5n

Statutes:

28 U.S.C. 1292(b) 3

28 U.S.C. 1391(b) 5

28 U.S.C. 1391(e) 1, 2, 3, 4, 6

Miscellaneous:

S. Rep. No. 1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. (1962), 2 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 2784-87 (1962) 4n

H.R. Rep. No. 536, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1962) 4n

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1978

No. 78-311

RODNEY D. DRIVER, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

vs.

RICHARD HELMS, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS BUNDY, CARTER, DAY & WATSON IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

This brief is submitted by respondents, McGeorge Bundy, Marshall S. Carter, J. Edward Day and W. Marvin Watson in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari filed on behalf of plaintiffs below, Rodney D. Driver, et al.

Question Presented

Does 28 U.S.C. §1391(e) subject private citizens, formerly employees of the federal government, to the jurisdiction and venue of every District Court in the country, regardless of where they reside, where the cause of action arose, or whether they have had any contact with the forum state?

Statement of the Case

This is a class action suit instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island in which petitioners seek to recover in excess of one billion dollars from each of these respondents, among others, for damages to the class allegedly arising from a mail interception program operated by the Central Intelligence Agency over a twenty year period, 1953-1973.

Respondents Bundy, Carter, Day and Watson are now, and for many years before this action was commenced were, private citizens. At the time of service they resided in New York, Colorado, Maryland and California, respectively. Petitioners concede that these respondents, who were served outside Rhode Island, never had any contact with that State. (Petition, p. 5). The only specific allegations in the amended complaint with regard to these respondents are that they held certain federal offices for certain periods of time, which were 5 years, 3 years, 2½ years and 9 months, respectively. The alleged conspiracy is supposed to have started 8 to 15 years before they entered their offices and continued from 10 to 4 years after they left.

The District Court denied the motion of these respondents to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue, ruling that under §1391(e) these respondents could be sued in the District Court in Rhode Island because each of them had served as a federal official at various times for relatively short periods long before this action was commenced, regardless of where the cause of action arose or whether these respondents had any contact with, or lived thousands of miles away from, the state of Rhode Island. *Driver* v. *Helms*, 74 F.R.D. 382 (D.R.I. 1977) (Appendix to Petition, pp. 21a-69a).

On an interlocutory appeal certified by the District Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1292(b), the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, in a unanimous opinion, reversed the District Court, ruling:

> "We do not, however, find any indication in the statute itself [28 U.S.C. §1391(e)] or in the legislative history that former officials were meant to be included. We are not alone in this conclusion. *See Kipperman* v. *McCone,* 422 F.Supp. 860, 876 (N.D. Cal. 1976). *Wu* v. *Keeney,* 384 F.Supp. 1161, 1168 (D.D.C. 1974)."

Driver v. *Helms,* 577 F.2d 147, 150 (1st Cir. 1978) (Appendix to Petition, pp. 4a-5a). On the basis of the holding of the First Circuit on this single issue, which is clearly correct, this action against these respondents should be dismissed.

ARGUMENT

The instant petition, especially to the extent that it raises the question of whether §1391(e) applies to these respondents—each long divorced from government service—presents no issues worthy of certiorari. It does not present any important questions of law, nor is there a conflict among the Circuits. The petition merely calls for the review of the First Circuit's interpretation of a statute enacted by Congress, having plain language that is clear on its face and a legislative history that confirms the statute's plain meaning.

Section 1391(e), on its face, does not apply its expanded service of process provision to a former official, but only to a person who ". . . *is* an officer or employee of the United States or an agency thereof *acting* in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, . . ." (emphasis added).

The plain meaning of §1391(e) in this regard is confirmed by its legislative history. Congress adopted §1391(e) to make federal agencies and employees, not private citizens long divorced from government service, amenable to a suit locally in actions that are in essence against the United States.* There was no need to extend the scope of §1391(e) to former officials to accomplish that end and Congress did not do so.

In contending that §1391(e) applies to former officials, both petitioners and the District Court substitute their perceptions of policy for what Congress stated in §1391(e) and intended. Neither could point to any reference in the legislative history to support their reading of statute on this point. Significantly, petitioners do not dispute the First Circuit's finding that there is no indication in the statute or its legislative history that former officials were intended to come within its purview. (Petition, p. 9).

1. No Important Questions of Law

The ruling of the First Circuit does not inhibit a citizen from seeking redress of violations of constitutional rights. Petitioners, who reside one each in California, Minnesota, New York, Connecticut and Rhode Island, disingenuously assert that private citizens, unable to bring actions at their places of residence against former officials, will likely not bring suit at all to redress constitutional torts. (Petition, p. 7). To the contrary, the victims of wrongful government conduct can obtain redress in the place of their residence under §1391(e) in actions against the federal government and government officials serving in the capacities in which they performed the acts on which their liability is based.

---

* *See, e.g.*, S. Rep. No. 1992, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. (1962), 2 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 2784-87 (1962); H.R. Rep. No. 536, 87 Cong., 1st Sess. (1962).

See, Bivens v. *Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). If they choose, they may bring suit against former officials, separately or with present government officials, where the former officials reside or where the cause of action arose, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and the Federal Rules. Thus, the First Circuit's rule has no real effect on a citizen's liability to redress constitutional torts.

Indeed, petitioners' conduct in this case belies their own policy argument. Notwithstanding the First Circuit's ruling, several of the named petitioners have successfully brought actions against the United States in other jurisdictions under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §1346(b), upon the very allegations of a mail interception program that form the basis of their amended complaint.* None of these respondents were defendants in those cases.

In the 7 years since this Court's decision in *Bevins, supra*, there have been only 4 reported cases, other than the one at bar, in which the issue of plaintiffs' ability to bring suit in the places of their residence against former officials under §1391(e) has arisen. *Wu* v. *Keeney*, 384 F.Supp. 1161 (D.D.C. 1974); *Lowenstein* v. *Rooney*, 401 F.Supp. 952 (E.D.N.Y. 1975); *Kipperman* v. *McCone*, 422 F.Supp. 860 (N.D. Cal. 1976); *United States* v. *McAninch*, 435 F.Supp. 240 (E.D.N.Y. 1977).**

---

* *See, e.g., Birnbaum* v. *United States*, 436 F.Supp. 967 (E.D. N.Y. 1977) appeal pending (2d Cir.); *Driver* v. *United States*, 77-C-919 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 1978); *Wilson* v. *United States*, 77-C-975 (E.D.N.Y., Feb. 17, 1978). *Avery* v. *United States*, 434 F.Supp. 937 (D. Conn. 1977).

** Petitioners err in stating that the only case in accord with the First Circuit's view of §1391 on this point is *Wu* v. *Kenney*, *supra*. In *Kipperman* v. *McCone, supra*, a case substantially identical to this action and cited by the First Circuit, (Appendix to Petition, p. 5a), the Court ruled that §1391(3) on its face and in light of its legislative history is not applicable to former officials. Indeed, there are only two decisions to the contrary. *Lowenstein*

2. No Conflict Among the Circuits

On the limited issue of whether §1391(e) applies to persons who left government employment many years before the commencement of the action, even petitioners do not seriously contend that there is a conflict among the Circuits. (Petition, p. 8). In *Briggs* v. *Goodwin*, 569 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1977), *petition for cert. pending sub nom. Stafford* v. *Briggs* (No. 77-1545), the District of Columbia Court of Appeals simply did not address the issue of whether §1391(e) applies to such former officials. No Circuit Court, other than the First Circuit, has decided the question of whether private citizens who were formerly federal officials fall within the ambit of §1391(e).

---

v. *Rooney*, *supra*, had ignored the decisions of the Second Circuit that had limited §1391(e) to actions in essence against the government which, prior to 1972, could only have been brought in the District of Columbia. See *Liberation News Service* v. *Eastland*, 426 F.2d 1379 (2nd Cir. 1970); *Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 459 F.2d 255 (2d Cir. 1972). *United States* v. *McAninch*, *supra*, contains no independent analysis on this point, and relies solely on the District Court's decision in this case, which, of course, was subsequently overruled by the First Circuit.

CONCLUSION

For the reason stated above the petition for certiorari should be denied.

Dated: September 21, 1978

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD J. COHN
Attorney for Respondents
Bundy, Carter, Day and Watson
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10020
(212) 582-3370

Of Counsel:

JAMES V. KEARNEY
WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD

ALAN T. DWORKIN
AISENBERG & DWORKIN